PRO
VERITATE
ET
REGNO
DEI

CHARLES HOLBROOK LIBRARY
Pacific School of Religion

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

https://archive.org/details/catholic-biblical-quarterly_1942_4

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly

EDITORIAL STAFF

Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.D., *Editor-in-Chief*
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Right Rev. William L. Newton, M.A., S.S.D.
Our Lady of the Lake Seminary, Cleveland, Ohio
Rev. Wendell S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.
St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.
Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.
Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.
Rev. Edward Donzé, S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Rev. John P. Weisengoff, S.T.D., S.S.L.
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Rev. Anthony C. Cotter, S.J., S.T.D.
Weston College, Weston, Mass.
Rev. Cyril Gaul, O.S.B., *Publishing Editor*
St. Meinrad Seminary, St. Meinrad, Ind.

VOLUME FOUR

1942

Published Quarterly by
The Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Washington, D. C.
1942

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

68651

V. 4
1942

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

President
Very Rev. T. Plassmann, O.F.M.
St. Bonaventure, N. Y.

Vice-President
Rev. John F. Rowan
Philadelphia, Pa.

Consultors
Rev. Edward P. Arbez, S.S.
Washington, D. C.

Rt. Rev. William L. Newton
Cleveland Ohio

General Secretary
Rev. Edward H. Donzé, S.M.
Washington, D. C.

Recording Secretary
Rev. John J. Dougherty
Darlington, N. J.

Treasurer
Rev. John E. Steinmueller
Huntington, N. Y.

Editor-in-Chief, CBQ
Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J.
Washington, D. C.

Publishing Editor, CBQ
Rev. Cyril Gaul, O.S.B.
St. Meinrad, Ind.

Chairman, Membership Committee
Rev. Matthew P. Stapleton
Brighton, Mass.

COMMITTEES

Program Committee

Very Rev. T. Plassmann, O.F.M.
St. Bonaventure, N. Y.

Rev. Edward P. Arbez, S.S.
Washington, D. C.

Rt. Rev. William L. Newton
Cleveland, Ohio

Rev. Edward H. Donzé, S.M.
Washington, D. C.

Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J.
Washington, D. C.

Nominating Committee

Rev. J. S. Considine, O.P.
River Forest, Ill.

Rev. Louis Hartman, C.SS.R.
Esopus, N. Y.

Rev. Richard Dobell
Toronto, Canada

Rev. Kevin Smyth, O.F.M.Cap.
Marathon, Wis.

Committee on Credentials

Rev. Edward H. Donzé, S.M.
Washington, D. C.

Rev. Edward A. Cerny, S.S.
Baltimore, Md.

Rev. John J. Collins, S.J.
Weston, Mass.

Committee on Resources

Rev. John E. Steinmueller
Huntington, N. Y.

Rt. Rev. Albert G. Meyer
St. Francis, Wis.

Rev. Patrick J. Temple
New York, N. Y.

Committee on Membership

Rev. Matthew S. Stapleton
Brighton, Mass.

Rev. Maurice Hofer
Worthington, Ohio

Rev. Edward A. Mangan, C.SS.R.
Oconomowoc, Wis.

Rev. Damian Lyons, O.F.M.
Santa Barbara, Cal.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME FOUR

President's Address 5
Rev. Edward J. Byrne, S.T.D.

The Messianic Expectation in "The Assuption of Moses" ... 9
Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J.

The Appearances of the Risen Christ 22
Rev. Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

The New Testament in our Colleges 37
Rev. Eustace Smith, O.F.M., S.T.L., S.S.L.

Sacred Scripture in our Theology Course 45
Rev. Joseph P. O'Donnell, S.T.L., S.S.L.

The Old Testament and Retribution in this Life 101
Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.D.

Peter Denies His Lord 111
Rev. Gilmore H. Guyot, C.M., S.T.L., S.S.B.

Notes on the Stem d-b-r 119
Very Rev. Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., Ph. D., S.T.D.

The Prayer of Christ for St. Peter 133
Rev. Charles H. Pickar, O.S.A., S.T.L., S.S.L.

The Old Testament in St. Paul's Epistles 141
Rev. Charles J. Costello, O.M.I., S.T.D.

The Decalogue in the Preaching of Jeremias 197
Rev. Eustance Smith, O.F.M., S.T.L., S.S.L.

The Bible and the Liturgy 210
Rev. William J. Lallou, S.T.D.

The Political Theory of the New Testament 218
Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., Ph. D., S.T.D.

Notes on the Latin Text of the Book of Wisdom 230
Rev. Patrick W. Skehan, S.T.D.

The Moral Causes of the Flood 293
Rev. Donat Poulet, O.M.I., S.T.D., S.S.L.

"Tu es Petrus" 304
Rev. Anthony C. Cotter, S.J., S.T.D.

Ancient Wisdom and Modern Times 311
Rev. Matthew P. Stapleton, S.T.D., S.S.L.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

The Sin of Onan, Gen. 38:8-10 323
Rev. Charles F. DeVine, C.Ss.R., S.S.L.
Exposition of the Missal Epistles from Romans 51, 146, 244, 341
Rev. Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Obscurities in the Latin Psalter 58, 152, 252, 349
Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.
The Pontifical Biblical Commission of the Scientific Method of Teaching Scripture 63

Archaeological Corner

Bethel (Beitin) 68
Lithostrotos 159
Jerusalem: Palace of Herod the Great 258
Rev. Edward A. Cerny, S.S., S.T.D.
The Date of Abraham 360
Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.D.
Survey of Periodicals: Old Testament 73, 262
Rev. Patrick W. Skehan, S.T.D.
Rev. John P. Weisengoff, S.T.D., S.S.L.
Survey of Periodicals: New Testament 161, 364
Rev. John J. Collins, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Rev. Anthony C. Cotter, S.J., S.T.D.
Biblical News 77, 172, 271
Obituary—Rev. William J. McGarry, S.J. 81
Visual Aids in the Teaching of Sacred Scripture 174
Fifth Annual Meeting of The Catholic Biblical Association . 175
Book Reviews 83, 192, 284, 372
Books Received 90, 192, 284, 375

BOOK REVIEWS

John E. Steinmueller, *A Companion to Scripture Study.* C. J. Callan, O.P. 83
Millar Burrows, *What Mean these Stones.* Edward A. Cerny 86
Herman Vogelstein, *Rome, A History of the Jews in Rome.* Edward A. Mangan 86
Albert E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence.* Joseph L. Lilly, C.M. 86
H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Bible in its Ancient and English Version.* John P. Weisengoff 89
William McGarry, *He Cometh.* Charles G. Heupler, O.F.M.Cap. 186

Simon Youngfleisch, *A Scientific Hebrew Grammar.* William H. McClellan, S.J. 187

Martin Kiddle, *The Revelation of St. John.* J. S. Considine, O.P. 189

Grace T. Trumbull, *Tongues of Fire.* Charles H. Pickar, O.S.A. 191

The Sunday Epistles and Gospel. Charles H. Pickar, O.S.A. 192

Newton Thompson and Raymond Stock, *The Concordance of the Bible.* Charles H. Pickar, O.S.A. 273

Jacques Maritain, *The Living Thoughts of St. Paul.* Joseph L. Lilly, C.M. 273

John E. Steinmueller, *A Gospel Harmony.* R. T. Murphy, O.P. 285

Julian Morgenstern, *Amos Studies.* Edward F. Siegman, C.Pp.S 278

Robert H. Peiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament.* Patrick Cummins, O.S.B. 280

An Indexed Bibliography of the Writings of William Foxwell Albright. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J. 282

The New Testament in Basis English. Edward A. Magan, C.Ss.R. ... 283

Stephen J. Hartdegen, *A Chronological Harmony of the Gospels.* Cyril Gaul, O.S.B. 372

George L. Robinson, *The Bearing of Archaeology on the Old Testament.* James E. Coleran, S.J. 373

Manual Komroff, *In the Years of Our Lord.* F. X. Peirce, S.J. 374

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

Delivered by Reverend Edward J. Byrne, S.T.D., retiring President, at the closing session of the annual meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association held in Philadelphia, Nov. 15-16, 1941.

Your Excellency, Right Reverend and Reverend Fathers:

Our fifth general Meeting, now drawing to a close, has been held in the midst of world conditions most disconcerting for Christians. A year ago at the time of our last Meeting, there was some hope of a limitation of the political and military conflict affecting the interests which we have at heart and which have called us together. Today the indications are of even a worldwide extension of these regrettable conditions and of a consequent further embarrassment for the normal pursuit of biblical studies and teaching.

From the afflicted countries of Europe, however, notwithstanding the lamentable efforts to oppose and offset the influence of Christian teaching, there have come some reports of an encouraging nature. Despite the systematic attempts to propagate materialistic forms of religion, there have been manifested in those very countries considerable indications of a reaction and an increase of interest in supernatural religion, divine revelation, and the Holy Scriptures. The production of new academic work on Scriptural subjects has become, as was to be expected, very limited. But according to reliable reports, there have been to a remarkable degree an increased interest in the reading of the Scriptures, a large demand for copies of the Bible and for popular explanations thereof. Moreover, it is pleasing to note that a goodly number of Theological and Scriptural Reviews of European countries have managed to continue publication, even though the printing and in particular the distribution of the individual numbers have been ordinarily considerably delayed.

It is particularly pleasing to recall that the reviews of the Pontifical Biblical Institute at Rome, *Biblica* and *Verbum Domini,* have been able to maintain publication. It is also noteworthy that some of the Theological and Scriptural Reviews in Germany have succeeded in carrying on publication. It will interest you to know that the German authorities in occupied Paris, in addition to permitting the publication of the Memorial Volume, prepared before the invasion of France, in honor of

Père Lagrange, have also permitted the publication of some of the belated numbers of the *Revue Biblique.* From Jerusalem has come the announcement that Père Abel's Commentary on the Books of the Machabees is nearing completion. From Rome there have come the first fascicules of the Hebrew lexicon of Father Zorell. There may likewise be other such works of importance in production even in the war-afflicted countries of Europe. So, even from the other side of the ocean, there are sources of comfort and encouragement in the midst of conditions certainly of a depressing nature for those who seek to advance the study of Sacred Scripture.

Turning to the consideration of conditions in our own country and of the cause which we have espoused, there are likewise reasons for encouragement. Aside from the increased interest in religion and in the study of the Holy Scriptures manifested outside the Church, the welcome given to the efforts of our Biblical Association on the part of our own Catholics is a source of great encouragement. The publication of the *Commentary on the Parables of Our Lord* by Very Rev. Father Callan, of the *Theologia Fundamentalis* of Father Cotter, of the *General Introduction* by Father Steinmueller, of the volume on the *Extent of the Deluge* by Father Poulet, of the Devotional Commentary of our regretted Father McGarry on the Discourse of Our Lord at the Last Supper (*Unto the End*), the publication of a *Hebrew Grammar* only a few days ago by Father Simon Yungfleisch, are all signs of healthy literary activity and reasons for commendation on the part of the Association.

On the one hand the spectacle of what is happening in Europe, the consideration of its causes, the moral and religious issues involved, and the spectre of its approach to our own country have caused a revival of religion in general amongst us. A sense of the helplessness of what one may describe as natural religion has created a more respectful consideration of the claims of supernatural, revealed religion, and in some circles at least a looking to the ancient Mother Church for guidance. Unfortunately many of the non-Catholic literary productions of this revival indicate a lack of real conviction in the divinity of the Christian revelation, a lack of faith in the divinity of its Founder. On the other hand the healthy growth of our Association, the continued support of our *Biblical Quarterly,* and above all the completion and publication of the Association's revised text of the New Testament are signs of growing strength on our part and causes to gladden the hearts of the members of our Society. The immense circulation which the Confraternity version has already received in the homes of our people is a source of joy and satisfaction. Notwithstanding some imperfections in the work, to which attention has been called in our meeting this afternoon—imperfections forming only a comparatively small part of the whole text—the work as a whole is one of which the Association and particularly those who had a close part in its production may be justly proud.

Much of the session this afternoon has been given to a discussion of some of the imperfections which are recognized to exist in our version. The existence of imperfections in this first edition was to be expected. They can be gradually eliminated in suceeding editions. The existence of these imperfections does not in my judgment constitute as great a danger as would a spirit of complacency which would tolerate their being permitted to remain in the text.

There is, according to my viewpoint (I speak as one less wise) a source of real danger which the publication of this new English version may create, namely, that it may be regarded as in itself an adequate text for the instruction of our seminarians in the "Preambula Fidei." However great may be the merits of our version, we must not forget what precisely is its nature and critical value. The text of a version, far removed by many stages from the text of the Scriptures in their original language, cannot be regarded as an ideal text for critical use in the classroom. The Editors of our version have felt at times the difficulty of deciding just what is to be considered the proper reading of the ancient Vulgate version, and have in many cases adopted and translated readings other than that of the Sixto-Clementine Edition. In many cases they have felt bound to let the reader know that readings of the Vulgate as followed do not agree with the critical edition of the Greek text. These facts help to emphasize the truth that the Vulgate readings which are at the basis of our revised version are from the standpoint of textual criticism only one of the many sources of information which have to be weighed in judging what was the original text. It would consequently be regrettable if the Confraternity Edition were to be used by our seminarians as an adequate foundation for the laying of the foundations of our faith. No version from the viewpoint of textual criticism can adequately fill the place of a critical text based on the study of the best Greek manuscripts, of the Versions and of the Patristic quotations.

In laying the foundations of our apologetics of the Christian religion, it is necessary in these days that we pay particular attention to the matter of Special Instruction which deals with the credibility of the Gospel, with the fact of Divine Revelation through Jesus Christ. One of the lamentable facts connected with the state of things in Europe is that some of the leaders who are most antagonistic to the Church are fallen-away Catholics. Of course moral defection does not always have an intellectual foundation. But one cannot at times help wondering what might be the condition of the world today, if these leaders had been better founded in their religion during their youth. On the other hand, one cannot but note with pleasure that the peoples of Europe which are making the strongest resistance to the efforts at de-Christianization are those among whom Christian education is recognized to have been the most solidly built. The condition of the world today is undoubtedly the result of lack of observance of Christian principles. It does not come within the purpose of our meeting here to inquire concerning the causes of the underlying lack of faith in Christian religion; it is our duty to do what we can to withstand it.

We have been in this meeting paying some particular attention to the place of Scripture in our seminary and college courses. Attention has been given to the philosophical and the theological treatment of the Scriptures. There should be, I think, an increase of attention to the historical treatment of the Sacred Books. There is of course always to be kept in our teaching a happy mean between that which is suited for future specialists and that necessary for future parish-priests. In any case, an adequate knowledge of the critical problems introductory to the Sacred Writings leads to a higher degree of solid piety and to a more intelligent fulfillment of pastoral obligations. One does not need extensive acquaintance with the literary products of today to realize that un-Christian and anti-Christian influences are seemingly increasing. If we are to make successful our efforts to withstand the process of de-Christianization of our civilization, there must be a greater effort on our part to emphasize the historical reality of Jesus Christ and of His divine message to humanity.

THE MESSIANIC EXPECTATION IN "THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES"

The subject of this paper is messianic expectation, not in the assumption of Moses, either in general or as the author of the work now to be considered, but in the Old Testament apocryphon which is usually known as "The Assumption of Moses"; and it is offered in criticism of the interpretation of that document by Dr. Charles, its well known editor.

It may be as well to outline the evidence for messianic expectation as a whole, into which fits the particular evidence now to be discussed. The chief evidence is Holy Scripture itself, first the Old Testament as the main evidence of the expectation. The extra-biblical Jewish evidence falls into three main classes, which may be designated roughly as the rabbinical, the apocryphal and the Greek. The rabbinical evidence, I think I may safely say, is chiefly, though not exclusively, represented by the Targums, Aramaic translations of the Old Testament originally used in the synagogues to interpret the Hebrew text to the congregation at a time when Hebrew had become more or less a dead language. It may be enough to note here that the Targums contain not only much free paraphrase, but also comments upon the text, which are sometimes of considerable length; moreover, that as a rule they are quick to apply Old Testament texts to the Messiah, thus testifying to a vivid messianic expectation several centuries after the New Testament period.

The Greek evidence consists mainly of the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus. The letter of Aristeas belongs to this class of literature, but has practically no bearing upon messianic expectation. To the Septuagint belong certain late works which deserve mention upon their own merits as a part of the Jewish apologetic addressed to the Greeks. This Greek or Hellenistic movement may be said to have begun about a couple of centuries before Christ, and to have ended about a century after, probably under the influence of the second Jewish war and of the spread of Christianity. Judaism may be said to have found itself outbid, and to have shut itself up in its shell, but not without leaving valuable evidence of a wider outlook that (as Christians, at all events, are likely to think) was more solidly implanted in the Old Testament than was the strict "hedge about the Law."

By the apocryphal evidence I mean here the evidence of entirely unofficial pseudepigrapha and apocalypses, which show the hopes and expectations of a fairly large number of utterly unknown writers. It is precisely for this reason that their writings are valuable; they show us that ideas were rife about the Messiah which were at once fluid and more grandiose than those current in more official circles. The term "pseudigraphic," used of these or any other works, means that they were not written by those whose names they bear. We may apply it in a wide sense to the *Assumption of Moses* inasmuch as most of it is set forth as a prophecy made by Moses to Joshua, whereas Moses certainly had no part in the work. The *Assumption* is a more or less typical apocalypse, in that it takes the outward form of a revelation concerning a world crisis yet to come, in this case a crisis both messianic and eschatological. These works are usually attributed to some great character of old (in this case, Moses) who is represented as prophesying all that is to happen up to the time of the writer, and then dilating upon the crisis that is to follow. This transition from what is really past history to mere conjecture is easily noticed in the work under consideration, and gives us a tolerably clear notion of the date of the work. Herod the Great has died, and it is said that his sons will rule for shorter periods than he did (vi, 7). As a matter of history, both Philip and Antipas reigned for longer periods than their father. Hence it seems safe to assume that the work was written after the deposition of Herod's son Archelaus in 6 A.D., but before Philip and Antipas had outreigned their father,[1] that is to say, before 30 A.D. Hence, as Dr. Charles writes (Ed. 1897, p. lviii), "the book was composed between the years 7–30 A.D." It thus assumes a special interest as having been written during Christ's hidden life at Nazareth.

Having mentioned Dr. Charles, it is only right, however needless it may be, that I should acknowledge the heavy debt which students owe him for his work upon these Jewish pseudepigrapha and apocalypses. This paper of mine is based mainly upon his edition of the *Assumption of Moses* published by A. and C. Black in 1897; but I have also taken account of the secondary and slighter edition of the work which he later incorporated in his large collection of *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1913).

[1] Herod the Great was declared King of Judaea at Rome in 40 B.C., and established his power in 37 B.C.; he died probably in 4 B.C. Philip died in 34 A.D.; Antipas was banished in 39 A.D.

It is an example of the popularity of this kind of literature in Christian circles that the text of the *Assumption* should have to be recorded from a Latin MS. discovered by Ceriani in a 6th century MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. Other such texts have been recovered from Greek, Syriac, Ethiopic, and even Slavonic translations. As a matter of fact, Dr. Charles makes it clear that the so-called *Assumption of Moses*, with which I am dealing, is really the original *Testament of Moses*, and that the *Assumption of Moses* was a distinct work, now almost entirely lost. Whether, as Dr. Charles maintains, the two came to be amalgamated into one, seems to be doubtful; one can recognize the great value of Dr. Charles' work and nevertheless feel that now and then he is somewhat hasty in his conclusions. I myself shall continue for convenience to call the work now under consideration the *Assumption*, while admitting that it should rather be called the *Testament*.

In the present text of the *Assumption* Dr. Charles wishes to transpose chapters VIII-IX so as to place them between chapters V and VI. Chapter V represents the beginning of troubles under the Seleucids, especially Antiochus IV Epiphanes. In chapter VI we seem clearly to have jumped to the Hasmonaean (or Maccabean) dynasty and to the Herods who succeeded it. Chapter VII, according to Charles, is an attack upon the Sadducees of about 15–70 A.D., but this, as I shall shortly be insisting, is inconsistent with his date of 7–30 A.D. for the book as a whole, so that it is better to regard the chapter as attacking the Sadducees of the writer's own time. Charles appears to me correct in regarding VIII as a summary of the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes; in this chapter, as he shows in his notes, we have details corresponding fairly closely with what we know of that persecution; and (what is incredible) it would otherwise be altogether omitted from the story.

Hence the insertion of VIII between V and VI appears to be amply justified. A writer living in the time of Christ could not make the mistake of supposing that the persecution of Antiochus followed upon the reigns of the Herods, since the Herods were ruling in his own lifetime. It is therefore correct to conclude with Charles to a dislocation of the chapter. But what of chapter IX: is Charles right in transposing it along with VIII? For my part I feel convinced that he is wrong, and that his error in this matter vitiates in great measure his interpretation of the book. Chapter IX, I believe, should be left where it is, unless the plan of the work is to be reduced from order to chaos. Burkitt[2] realized this, but supposed that in IX the writer was filling out the picture of the final woes from the story of Antiochus' persecution. This does not seem likely; but I shall indicate later the element of truth which may underlie the suggestion.

In chapter IX a man Taxo arises, of the tribe of Levi, and addresses his sons, speaking of the calamities of his nation. He proposes that they retire together to a cave, and die: "For if we do this, our blood will be avenged before the Lord." Then comes chapter X, which evidently goes on to speak of the consummation that will follow:

> And then shall his kingdom appear throughout all
> his creation,
> And then Satan shall be no more,
> And sorrow shall depart with him.

And so forth. I shall return to the name Taxo and some other details later, only noting at once that the Latin text leaves no doubt about the beginning of chapter X: *Et tunc parebit regnum illius*, etc. Charles seems right in saying that this chapter is metrical; it expresses in the usual style of apocalypses the writer's expectation of the final crisis.

If, then, with Charles we transfer IX along with VIII, all is confusion, since Taxo and the final consummation follow upon Antiochus' persecution in VIII, and then, after his consummation, we pass, as if nothing had happened, to the Hasmonaean and Herodian dynasties in chapter VI. I have looked in vain for any attention of Charles to this objection, which would leave me quite bewildered were it not for the far greater blunder in his treatment of chapter VII. For, having (rightly, as I think) assigned the composition of the whole book to the years 7–30 A.D., he interprets VII as an attack upon the Sadducees of 15–70 A.D. That is to say, he makes the book refer to a time at least forty years later than the time at which he supposes it to have been written. His treatment of the subject in this earlier work, to put it mildly, shows signs of haste. In his later edition he expresses himself more cautiously, and need not be understood to be guilty of so glaring a contradiction.

---

[2] Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, III, p. 449.

To what, then, does chapter VII really refer? Not to the Sadducees of 15–70 A.D., which is an impossible solution, but rather to the Sadducees of the writer's own time. Herod's son Archelaus, it will be remembered, was banished in 6 A.D., and his territory (Judaea, Samaria, Idumaea) became the Roman procuratorial province of Judaea. Supposing, therefore, as Charles seems right in holding, that the book was written between 7 and 30 A.D., it would have been written under the rule of the Roman procurators. Supposing again, as I think Charles sufficiently shows, that it is an attack on the Sadducees, the latter must have been the high-priestly Sadducean families of New Testament times. The writer was not especially interested in the Romans, and the control of all Palestine in matters religious was chiefly left by the rulers to these high-priestly families. The author inveighs bitterly against them, and it is to save the people from this scourge that Taxo is prepared to fast and to die along with his sons.

If once this point be granted, that the author is attacking the rule of the Sadducean high priests of his own time, then we can fix the date of the work somewhat more precisely. While we assent to Charles' view that it was written between 7 and 30 A.D., we can now go further and say that it is far more likely that it was written only a little before 30 A.D.; this against Burkitt,[3] who would put the date soon after 6 A.D., and against Ferrar,[4] who would have it nearer 7 than 30 A.D. This Sadducean rule must have had time to develop and to become a national institution, which it could hardly do under Herod the Great or his successor Archelaus; it was the Romans who allowed it considerable latitude in matters religious, in return for a steady support of Roman rule. This support, it is true, was not based upon any sentimental loyalty, but upon the solid and practical foundation alike of fear and of self-interest. In matters essential the high priests and the Romans worked together, and it is significant that early in the Jewish war the high priest Ananias was murdered.[5]

At this stage an answer may be attempted to the question, how came chapter VIII to be transferred to a position just before the messianic crisis, in spite of the fact that the Hasmonaean and

---

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 448.

[4] In the small S. P. C. K. edition.

[5] Cf. Josephus, *Jewish War*, III, xvii, 9; Acts 23:3.

Herodian dynasties followed upon the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, with which chapter VII is concerned? No doubt we may presume some ignorance of history in a later scribe; but I am inclined to think that the immediate cause of the transference was the fact that Antiochus' persecution immediately precedes the final crisis in the Book of Daniel. In Dan. 8:8-9 the "four horns" are the four chief Hellenistic kingdoms, and the "little horn" is Antiochus IV, as is also the "little horn" in Dan. 7:8, and the "one despised" in 11:21. This was early seen in Christian exegesis. Furthermore, St. Jerome, who was followed by St. Thomas Aquinas, recognized that by a certain compenetration, as I have long called it, a type, or rather what is said of the type, may contain within itself what is proper to the antitype, which glows through, as it were, and manifests in large outline what we might only vaguely distinguish if our eyes were closed to all save the type itself. Let me first quote St. Thomas, who (as we might expect) is the clearer of the two in his enunciation of the principle. The following passage is taken from the preface to his Commentary on the Psalms:[6]

> Prophecies are sometimes uttered about things which existed at the time in question, but are not uttered primarily with reference to them, but in so far as they are a figure of things to come; and therefore the Holy Ghost has provided that when such prophecies are uttered, some details should be inserted which go beyond the actual thing done, in order that the mind may be raised to the thing signified. Thus, in Daniel many things are said of Antiochus as a figure of Antichrist; wherefore some things are therein read which were not accomplished in the case of Antiochus, but will be fulfilled in Antichrist.

In writing thus St. Thomas is doubtless drawing upon St. Jerome's commentary on Dan. 11:21 ff., wherein the latter gives it as the current Catholic opinion of his day that Antiochus was a type of Antichrist, "and that what befell Antiochus beforehand in part, is to be accomplished in Antichrist in full. And that this is the wont of Holy Writ, to anticipate in types the truth of things that are to be, as in what is said of the Lord our Savior in Psalm 71, which has Solomon's name prefixed to it, whereas all that is said of Him cannot apply to Solomon."[7]

St. Jerome proceeds to prove this statement, and concludes: "As, therefore, the Savior has both Solomon and the other holy men as a type of His coming, so Antichrist has that most wicked king Antiochus." St. Thomas also dwells on Ps. 71 (72 in R. V. *et al.*), as likewise does St. Augustine in the *De Civitate Dei,* doubtless himself drawing upon Jerome,[8] but without touching on Daniel and Antiochus. Thus the phenomenon of compenetration has strong support in Catholic tradition, and affords, I believe, a valuable principle of exegesis. The late Dr. Samuel Driver went far towards admitting it when he wrote of Ps. 110 (Vulg. 109, *Dixit Dominus*) as "depicting a king invested with an ideal dignity and ideal powers," and in this sense messianic.[9] Lord Bacon also lays it down in the *Advancement of Learning,* early in the Second Book, that divine prophecies "have springing and germinant accomplishment throughout many ages, though the height or fulness of them may refer to some one age."

---

[6] E.g. Parma edition, 1863, p. 149.

[7] *In Danielem* 11:21; MPL 25, 565.

My own purpose in dwelling upon this principle of compenetration as applied to Antiochus Epiphanes is to suggest that this may explain how his persecution came to be displaced and to be put just before the final consummation as foretold in the *Assumption of Moses.* With this consummation it may have come to be linked, not only in the Book of Daniel and in the exegesis of that book, but in the expected sequence of actual events. On the part of a sixth-century Latin redactor, a careful reading of St. Jerome's words should have prevented such a mistake, whereas a careless reading of them, and of the Book of Daniel itself, might well have caused it.

With the ground thus sufficiently cleared and prepared, we may now come more directly to the question of messianic expectation in the *Assumption of Moses.* I have said above that the writer was not especially interested in the Romans; instead, he levels his attack at the Sadducean high priests. Charles appears to be correct in saying that he was a Pharisaic quietist; he was prepared to submit patiently to the Roman yoke, and to commit his cause to God, who would soon remove that yoke. He had no sympathy with insurrection, but awaited a direct intervention from heaven. Hence he was hostile to the Hasmonaean dynasty and to the militant Judaism which it had stirred up. "There will be raised up unto them," he writes, "kings bearing rule, and they will call themselves high priests of God: they will assuredly work iniquity in the holy of holies" (chap. VI). It must be admitted that the Hasmonaean dynasty had ended ingloriously; like the Seleucid lines, it was a standing example of the truth that a house divided against itself cannot stand. Still, it had known glorious days, and the Gospels bear witness to the fact that Judas, Simon and John were still national heroes after whom children were named. The writer appears to hold that "kings bearing rule" and carrying on war had no business to assume the dignity of high priests, or to minister in the holy of holies.

---

[8] *De Civitate Dei* XVII, viii; MPL 41, 540-542. This work was written 413-426 A.D. (*Enchiridion Patristicum,* ed. Rouët de Journel, S.J., §1738), and St. Jerome's Commentray on Daniel in 407 A.D. (F. Cavallera, *S. Jérôme,* Paris and Louvain, 1922, II, p. 163).

[9] S. R. Driver, *Studies in the Psalms,* edited by Prof. Burney, London, 1915, pp. 128-132.

Charles has seen that our author was a quietist, but he has not seen the full implication of this fact. Our author could not look for a Messiah who would rout his foes in battle, but rather for one who would accomplish the divine purpose of a more spiritual deliverance. Nor, of course, was he alone in this; from the beginning it has been the Christian faith that Christ died for our sins, and that His death was the fulfillment of the 53d chapter of Isaias. I shall not develop this argument at any length. So far as the Old Testament is concerned, I cannot think that any explanation of Isaias does justice to the text which does not include the Messiah's vicarious death. I may add that the principle of vicarious suffering seems to be ritually indicated more clearly than elsewhere in the rite of the scapegoat (cf. Lev. 16:21). In the New Testament, it is significant that it is immediately after allusions in the *Nunc Dimittis* to Isa. 40, 42, 49 and 52 (to mention chapters referred to by Nestle in the margin of his New Testament) that Simeon prophecies that the Child shall be a sign to be contradicted (Luke 2:34). St. Luke, in fact, lays emphasis on the suffering Messiah; he mentions that the risen Christ asks, "Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things" (Luke 24:26), and Philip finds the eunuch actually reading Isa. 53 (Acts 7:32-33). St. Paul also before Festus gave it as a main point in his teaching that the Messiah was to suffer (Acts 26:23). I need do no more than mention the Epistle to the Hebrews.

I shall not endeavor to press home the argument from these and other places of Holy Writ, since my purpose is merely to insist that one cannot *a priori* exclude the idea of a suffering Messiah from the *Assumption of Moses*. The final consummation is introduced in chapter IX by the appearance of a man called Taxo. He delivers an address to his seven sons, containing the following exhortation: "Let us fast for the space of three days, and on the fourth let us go into a cave which is in the field, and let us die rather than transgress the commands of the Lord of lords, the God of our fathers. For if we do this and die, our blood will be avenged before the Lord." There follows the poem depicting the final consummation, which makes up the present chapter X.

We have here a voluntary death for Israel, of the kind which has come to be known as a hunger-strike, a death so voluntary that it must surely be reprobated as a suicide; but that is an issue which there is no need to discuss. Evidently the writer looks upon it as heroic, and it is to bring about the final consummation. To put it into our modern language, Taxo is to be a suffering Messiah, and his death is to bring about a glorious deliverance. It is amazing that a writer so versed in the apocalyptic literature as Dr. Charles should pooh-pooh the notion of Taxo's being a Messiah (p. lxi), and quote with approval a remark of Colani's that the Taxo passage "has as much to do with the Messiah as with the Emperor Barbarossa" (*Assumption* x, 1, note).

This remark comes in the course of a discussion of the meaning of the name Taxo itself, in which Charles brushes aside far too contemptuously the explanation which seems to me most likely to be correct, viz., that Taxo is an *ab-bag* anagram, so to call it, for Shiloh, the Massoretic writing of the name occurring in Gen. 49:10, where the Authorized and Revised Versions read, "until Shiloh come." This rendering appears to me to be the less correct one, and I should prefer to read with the ancient authorities *shelloh* (שֶׁלֹּה) and to translate, "until he come whose they are" (i.e., the scepter and staff), or, less well, "until that come which is his." But the interest of this anagram would be to take the personal interpretation of "Shiloh" back to a far earlier date than that which is usually allowed for it. Dr. Samuel Driver, for example, in his commentary on Genesis[10] asserts that "the rendering 'until Shiloh come' is found in no known versions of the Old Testament till that of Sebastian Münster in 1534."

---

[10] *The Book of Genesis* (Westminster Commentaries), p. 410.

If Taxo is nevertheless an anagram for Shiloh, each Hebrew letter is moved one forward, so that *shin* becomes *taw,* and so on; while the one mistake in the extant form can easily be accounted for by the similarity of the letters, *samekh* having been read for *mem.* Thus in Hebrew שילה became תכסו (for תכמו), and was read "Taxo." If Shiloh was interpreted, rightly or wrongly, to mean "peaceful," or something of that kind, the attraction of the name for our Pharisaic quietist would be all the greater.

It may be objected that he explicitly assigns Taxo to the tribe of Levi; and it must be admitted that this certainly makes it more difficult to equate Taxo to the supposed Shiloh of Gen. 49: 10, who is generally, and no doubt rightly, understood to belong to Juda. Against this, however, it might possibly be urged that as a matter of fact Genesis does not definitely assign Shiloh to Juda, if, for the sake of argument, we suppose Shiloh to be the correct reading. And again, Charles is obviously correct when he finds in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs a tendency to assign the Messiah to the tribe of Levi, a tendency no doubt due to the influence of the Hasmonaean dynasty. It is curious that our author, in spite of his hostility to the dynasty, should have succumbed to this tendency.

In general it must be remembered that Jewish ideas about the Messiah were very fluid. This appears from all the sources bearing upon the subject in Père Bonsirven's important work *Le Judaïsme Palestinien.*[11] In general, the apocalyptic writers tended to make the Messiah superhuman, while the rabbis rather inclined to keep the Messiah strictly human and to make the divine intervention more largely that of God Himself. In this respect the *Assumption of Moses* stands rather with the rabbinical works: the death by fasting of Taxo and his sons may be said to bring on the divine intervention, but they have no further part in it, and they are not mentioned again. Hence the *Assumption* shares the general tendency to make no distinction between the future age and the days of the Messiah. The tendency, indeed, was to put eschatological rewards into the messianic age; but for such an age as distinct from the future age the *Assumption* can find no place, since it kills off Taxo almost as soon as it brings him on the scene. It may be well also to bear in mind that in a few apocalyptic works there is no Messiah whatever. What is striking in the Assumption is the vicarious death of the Messiah. This is not quite unique, but such a view is a rare one. It appears always to have been a rare one, since the New Testament, while adopting it, exhibits it as a stumbling-block to the Jews in general. Still, when we consider what appears to be the rather deliberate perversion of the Targum on Isa. 53 in such a way as to divert suffering from the Messiah, we may find it difficult to believe that such a deliberate distortion of the text was really primitive.

---

[11] *Le Judaïisme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ: sa théologie;* par J. Bonsirven, S.J., 2 vols.; Paris: Beauchesne, 1934-5. Vol. I, *La Théologie dogmatique:* chap. viii, *Le Messianisme, son établissement;* chap. ix, *Le Messianisme, le règne messianique.* See especially the scheme of details opposite p. 424.

If the sufferings of the Messiah and his divinity are found to have been an objection to the Christian Church from the beginning, so also was its universalism. The Jews, for example, listen patiently to Paul until he repeats the answer which he had received from Christ in vision: "Go, for I shall send thee forth to the nations afar off" (Acts 22:21). Then they try to kill him. That, however, was a rather different issue from the conversion of the Gentiles as such, which Jewish opinion to a large extent favored as a feature of the messianic days.[12] Still, some nations are at times excepted, especially Rome; and at times hostility is expressed towards the Gentiles in general. In the *Assumption of Moses* (chapter X) the Gentiles are to be punished and all their idols destroyed. In particular, it is said of Israel,

> Thou shalt look from on high and shalt see thine
> enemies in Ge[henna],
> And thou shalt recognize them and rejoice,
> And thou shalt give thanks and confess thy Creator.

The Latin text has *vides inimicos tuos in terram,* where Charles' *videbis* for *vides* is obvious. But I think that he is also probably right in supposing that *in terram* stood for *ἐν γῇ* and that this represented the Hebrew בְּגֵי after which הִנֹּם had fallen out. Originally the full name seems to have been גֵּי בֶן־הִנֹּם,[13] "the valley of the son of Hinnom." The valley, as is well known, came to stand for hell, as it does in the New Testament, owing to its evil association with the worship of "Moloch." This sense of hell suits the context in the *Assumption;* the Gentiles, as has been said, are to be punished; while on the other hand there would be no point in their being seen simply in a "valley."

---

[12] Bonsirven, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 458-460.

[13] The full absolute form is גַּיְא, and the construct can also be written גֵּיא. I have inserted the Hebrew pointing above for clearness, without intending to imply that it was necessarily in use when the Greek translation was made. I accept as most probable Charles' view that our Latin text is derived from a Hebrew original through a Greek translation.

A grave moral issue, however, is thus raised. Whatever we may think of heaven and hell as the final reward and punishment, it will hardly be thought right that the fate of the individual should be settled by his nationality rather than by his goodness or wickedness. In the *Assumption* all Israel is to be saved, all the Gentiles are to be lost; such appears to be the natural understanding of the text. Other Jewish writings tend to be hard on the Gentiles,[14] but I doubt whether any be so harsh in this respect as the Assumption.

To sum up. I submit that we have in the *Assumption of Moses* a work written only a short time before the opening of Christ's public ministry, in which we are presented with a Messiah whose true name is Shiloh. He is of the tribe of Levi; he suffers and dies, and in this way brings on the divine consummation, before which there is no messianic age. In fact, his *only* function is to suffer and die, and we read nothing else about him. In this divine consummation the Jews are all to be happy, but all the Gentiles are consigned to hell.

In conclusion, I may notice two points which are of some interest for the New Testament. Of Herod the Great it is said (*Assumption* vi, 4), "He shall slay the old and the young, and he shall not spare." This very definite reference to the young may cover the massacre of the Innocents, though the Latin word *iuvenes* would suggest a more advanced age. The evidence for the first two chapters of Matthew is good; we have from the beginning the supplanting of Jew by Gentile; the guidance by dreams is repeated later in the case of Pilate's wife; St. John (7:42) repeats an objection against Christ that the Messiah should come from Bethlehem, obviously supposing that his readers know the answer. The story of the virgin birth is of course supported by Luke. Without dwelling further on the question, I merely suggest that we can more easily understand the allusion in the *Assumption* if we suppose the writer to have had in mind the murder of the Innocents.

---

[14] Bonsirven, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 467.

The second point has some reference to the Epistle of Jude, surely one of the most astonishing books of the Bible. Dr. Charles has successfully shown, I think, that the work with which we have been dealing should really be called the *Testament* of Moses, and that the *Assumption* was a different work, which he has reconstructed in outline partly from the Epistle of Jude itself and comments thereupon, and partly from other early writings. I should think it less certain that the Epistle also draws upon our work, the *Testament,* but I mention Charles' view to that effect (pp. lxii-lxiii) with respect. Even so, I do not see that there is much to support Charles' view (pp. xlvii ff.) that the *Testament* and the *Assumption* came to be amalgamated. In the *Testament,* it may be noted, Moses is to die an ordinary death (pp. xlvii-xlviii), whereas in the *Assumption* Joshua had a twofold view of Moses: he saw him with the angels, and saw him also being buried.[15] These details, however, are of more interest in regard to the Epistle of Jude than with reference to any messianic expectation.

TABLE OF DATES

Herod the Great was declared king of Judaea at Rome	40 B.C.
He established his power	37 "
He died, probably	4 "
His son Archelaus was deposed	6 A.D.
His son Philip died	34 "
His son Antipas was banished	39 "
The *Assumption* was composed a little before	30 "

ORIGINAL ORDER OF THE ASSUMPTION

Chapter	V,	The beginnings of trouble under the Seleucid dynasty, especially under Antiochus IV Epiphanes.
"	VIII,	Persecution of Antiochus.
"	VI,	The Hasmonaean and Herodian dynasties.
"	VII,	Sadducees of the author's time.
"	IX,	Taxo.
"	X,	The final consummation.

CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J.

Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

---

[15] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* VI, xv; MPG 9, 356; Charles, pp. 106-110.

THE APPEARANCES OF THE RISEN CHRIST

OBJECTIVE OR SUBJECTIVE?

It is a well established historical fact that there existed shortly after the death of Jesus Christ a well defined although small group of loyal and devoted followers who were firmly and all through their lives unalterably convinced that they had seen Jesus Christ living in the same identical body which a few days before had breathed its last on the cross and had been laid cold and motionless in the tomb. The purpose of this paper is not to examine the gospel accounts of these manifestations with the purpose of arranging them in chronological sequence; neither is it to reconcile the apparent discrepancies in the several records. Our objective is to discuss the various hypotheses which have been elaborated in modern times to explain away these appearances or to explain them in a way that dispenses with belief in the physical resurrection of the corpse which had been taken from the cross and reverently interred by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus. In our discussion we hope to show that each of these theories is inadequate and unsatisfactory, bristling with difficulties greater than those which they are designed to solve. Finally we hope to demonstrate that the only satisfactory position is that which maintains that no other theory explains fully the unswerving life-long faith of the apostles than that Jesus Christ was really physically resuscitated, that the dead body was reanimated by the same identical soul which gave it life prior to the crucifixion.

The modern hypotheses can be reduced to four heads:

1. The appearances were subjective visions, in less euphemistic language they were plain hallucinations. P. K. McCowan, M.D., F.R.C.P., D.P.M., defines hallucination as a mental image projected outward as a perception in the absence of an external stimulus.[1] It differs from illusion, the same author observes, in that this latter is a subjectively distorted perception of a real object.[2] In every day language hallucination is imagining that one

---

[1] *British Medical Journal,* Issue of Sept. 23, 1939, No. 4107, p. 631. London.

[2] Grandmaison quotes the following from Emile Sergent: "illusion is to hallucination what libel is to slander. Illusion is a bad interpretation of a real perception; hallucination invents its object in all particulars." *Jesus Christ,* New York, 1934, III, p. 213.

sees something or some person where there is in reality neither thing nor person at all. According to one school, the holy women and apostles who claimed that they had seen the risen Lord were victims of hallucination. The evidence then in favor of our Lord's physical resurrection is thus deprived of all probative value.[3]

2. These appearances were objective visions. There really was a spiritual being existent and productive of the impression that a corporeal being was before them. There was, however, no real body present to produce the subjective sense impressions which they thought they experienced, although the living spirit of Jesus was there producing them. This seems to be a sort of attenuated hallucination.

3. The third explanation has recourse to the subliminal consciousness. Goguel has written a book of nearly five hundred pages to expound and prove this genesis of faith in the appearances of our Lord. He writes: the preparation for the conversion (of St. Paul) and the vision was unconscious; it transpired in the subliminal ego of the apostle, and when it reached its conclusion, it appeared to him as utterly sudden, as having been absolutely unforseen and unpredictable because it was in complete contradiction to his whole past, consequently it seemed to him as truly miraculous, exactly as in the case of Ratisbonne or Sundar Singh.[4] The conversion of Saul, continues Goguel, was preceded by no crisis of which he had any consciousness. Preparation for it was made by a deep-seated process which transpired in Paul's subliminal ego. This conviction exploded into the field of consciousness and objectivated itself in a vision.

4. The fourth explanation is that the appearances were nothing more than the ghostly experiences which the spiritualists have,—psychic phenomena which have been reproduced over and over again, as is evidenced by the data gathered by the Society for Psychic Research. A book has recently been devoted to explaining away all the miracles of Christ's life and His resurrection on the theory of psychic phenomena.[5]

---

[3] The most alluring and popular exposition or rather description of the hallucination theory is given by Ernest Renan in *The Apostles*, Tr. of Joseph Henry Allen, pp. 46-49, Boston, 1898.

[4] Quoted by Lagrange in *Revue Biblique*, Oct. 1933, p. 379, in a "recension" of Goguel's *La Foi en la résurrection de Jésus dans le christianisme primitif*.

[5] *Loaves and Fishes* by Hereward Carrington, New York, 1935.

Why do modern thinkers propound these theories to attempt to explain away the corporeal resurrection of our Lord? It is because, according to their philosophy, miracles do not, cannot happen. And since the corporeal resurrection of Jesus Christ was a great miracle, it must, according to the cardinal dogma of modern criticism, be explained in some natural way or denied. Percy Gardner may speak as the representative of this school:

> But to everyone accustomed to historic method and procedure the real question is, not whether such transgressions of natural law be possible, but what proof have we that they ever occur. And the evidence is insufficient. Nothing can be more certain than that the study of anthropology and of historic method so greatly indisposes men to accept miraculous narratives that they regularly reject them, not as disproved, but as so improbable that they need not be further considered.[6]

Rashdall states:

> The reanimation or sudden transformation into something neither altogether material nor altogether spiritual of a body really dead would entail the violation of the most surely known laws of physics, chemistry and physiology. Even though the evidence were fifty times stronger than it is, any hypothesis whatever would be preferable to that.[7]

These hypotheses and philosophical principles are far removed from the factual data of the Gospels. But that does not bother the critics in the least. They simply reconstruct the documents to fit their theories as to the way in which things must have happened. "It is easy," remarks Frank Morrison,[8] "to say that you will believe nothing that will not fit into the mould of a rationalist concept of the universe. But suppose the facts won't fit into that mold? The utmost that an honest man can do is to undertake to examine the facts patiently and impartially and to see where they lead him."

According to Karl Adam[9] the critics approach the study of Christ foredoomed to failure. They deny the supernatural. How then can they hope to understand the life of Him who is the very embodiment of the supernatural, whose every word and act is steeped in the supernatural? Jesus Christ becomes to them an enigma because of their blind devotion to a preconceived philosophy.

---

[6] *Evolution and Christian Doctrine*, New York, 1918, p. 40.

[7] Cited by Lake in The Historical Evidences for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. New York, 1907. p. 269. The position of Renan is well known. He objects that none of the Gospel miracles occurred under scientific conditions, and is quite willing to admit the probability of a resurrection if it took place under his "scientific" conditions. Cf. *Life of Christ*, p. 43-45.

[8] *Who Moved the Stone?* New York, 1930.

[9] Cf. Adam's remarkable chapter on this subject in his *The Son of God*, pp. 22-48, entitled "The Way of Faith."

Their philosophy is not in accord with historical fact. If they were truly scientific historians they would revise their philosophical principles, but they refuse to do so, and so lose all right to the respect of honest historians. Karl Adam says: "The historian may not in advance and on principle refuse absolutely to admit the possibility of a direct incursion of the divine into the realm of created beings: otherwise he will run the danger of doing violence to historical facts and divine realities in the name of his preconceived opinions and blind implicit faith in his own philosophical creed."[10]

Before considering the hallucination theories, let us give a brief summary of the fact as set down in the gospels relative to the appearances. The Gospels tell us that He, i.e. Jesus Christ, the same person, the same composite being, who walked the earth, ate, slept, conversed, and so forth, who was crucified, died and was buried, appeared subsequently, drew near to the Apostles, stood in their midst, was seen by them, ate with them, called attention to His wounds, invited them to put their fingers into the wounds, to touch Him, to handle Him, and finally reminded them that a ghost does not have flesh and bones as they could plainly see He had.

Now the question is: did the Apostles and holy women only imagine they saw and heard Jesus saying and doing these things over and over again in their midst? In other words were they victims of hallucination?

We grant that any sound and sane minded person may be a victim of momentary hallucinations; but almost as soon as one is conscious of these imaginary apparitions, one realizes their fictitious character and recognizes that they are wholly devoid of objective reality. But no sane person has permanent hallucinations. Dr. McCowan[11] writes: "While persistent hallucinations are a certain sign of grave and profound mental disorder, the experience of an occasional hallucination is by no means a rarity in the sane." Elsewhere in the same article he says:

---

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[11] *British Medical Journal*, Issue of Sept. 23, 1939, London. No. 4107, p. 631.

"Chronic hallucinations are caused by disassociation with reality, and dwelling on certain complexes along with a morbid egocentricity."[12] Dr. Macdonald Critchley, writing in the same journal,[13] lists the following causes of permanent hallucinations: epilepsy, migraine, fever, paralysis, chronic epidemic encephalitis, narcolepsy, drug addiction. The Encyclopaedia Brittanica[14] lists in addition to the foregoing as causes of chronic hallucination venereal disease, delirium tremens, hysteria, insanity.

Now the Apostles were permanently and unalterably convinced that they had seen the risen Lord, conversed with Him, eaten with Him, handled His body. Either, then, they were victims of permanent hallucination and therefore mentally unbalanced, or they actually saw Him after death risen to a new and real life in the same body which He had before His crucifixion.

But if they were victims of hallucination, they were insane, for the hallucination perdured throughout their long lives, and only the insane continue for any length of time under the spell of an hallucination. Now would anyone save an insane person contend that the author of the Pauline epistles could have been insane? Could anyone who had carefully read his epistles suspect that Paul was anything but a realist, i.e. one who was always in close touch with reality? Read the first chapter or the ninth of Romans for proof of his realism. Could anyone but an insane person seriously contend that the author of the fourth gospel was insane?

The authors of the Gospel have no symptoms whatever of insanity; on the contrary they give every evidence of having sound minds and vigorous physiques. "John and Peter were sober-minded fishmen, who understood how to mend their nets and to scrub a deck with a scrubbing brush. Matthew was a Jewish collector of taxes, and, as such, certainly did not dwell in castles in the air. Thomas had a sceptical and pronouncedly realistic nature."[15] Men of this type are not visionaries. The hallucination hypothesis supposes, contrary to all the evidence we have, that the primitive Christian community was made up of visionaries, half or wholly insane, utterly hysterical, who are immediately infected by hallucinations and spread the fever instantly to others.

---

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 632.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 634.

[14] Edition XIV. Art. Hallucinations, Vol. XI col. 105.

[15] Felder, *Christ and the Critics*, Vol. II, p. 426. New York, 1924. Tr. Stoddard.

The foregoing is amply sufficient to rule out the hypothesis of hallucination, but let us strengthen the argument with the following consideration: the victim of hallucinations must be psychologically prepared for them; there must be a psychological build-up. The hallucination follows the line of thought which its victim previously pursued with the utmost intensity and concentration. It follows the ardent desires and innermost yearnings of the soul. Maurenbrecher says: "We know now that visions, hallucinations.... are formed out of the material of fancies and feelings which already lay previously waiting in the consciousness of the man in question," and Binet-Sanglé, the psychologist, says: "A hallucination always presents things which are familiar to the victim of hallucination; it always refers to his mode of life, his occupations, his fixed ideas... it projects those pictures outward which he cherishes in the course of the reflections of his inner life."[16]

In the case of the Apostles we do not find any ardent yearning, any hope, any conviction of the resurrection,—the state of mind which would have been the necessary psychological prelude to imaginary visions. We find the Apostles fleeing and hiding in terror when their Master was arrested; they were so overcome with fear that they lacked the courage to stand by at His crucifixion.[17] Now if they had had the conviction that their Master would overcome death by a triumphant resurrection, they would have courageously remained with Him and awaited the moment of its realization. When finally He died on the cross—a scandal to every good Jew, from which he turned in horror[18]—every vestige of hope in the final triumph of their Master was crushed out of their souls. According to Mark 16:10, the Apostles were overcome with grief, which is certainly unintelligible in the hypothesis that they were convinced that He would presently rise again. We are not inconsolable at the temporary absence of a dear friend, especially when we know that the absence will speedily terminate in His glorious triumph and utter vindication.

---

[16] Cited by Felder, *op. cit.*, II, p. 424.

[17] St. John, the Beloved Disciple, is the sole exception to the overwhelming fear which sent all the other Apostles scurrying for a hidden shelter.

[18] Cf. 1 Cor. 1:23. Allo remarks: "'A crucified Christ,' the association of these two words was deemed at all times and in all countries nonsense and an intolerable absurdity, either to the gross Jews who saw in it the condemnation of their carnal hopes of prosperity and domination realized under the Messias, or to the Greeks who say that to have oneself arrested and executed as a common brigand is positively not the means of establishing a religion or a philosophy for sensible and respectable people." *Ep. aux Cor. ad loc.*

True it is that the Master had told them that He would rise again the third day, but on each of the three occasions,[19] the Apostles objected vehemently to the prediction of His death and did not understand it; it had no influence on them in their confused and distraught state of mind after the catastrophe of the crucifixion.

So little were they disposed to hope for the resurrection that when the first accounts of appearance were brought they showed themselves decidedly skeptical. Such is not the way of those who are ready victims of hallucination. They are only too eager and ready to accept any evidence that is in line with their fondly cherished hopes.

In fact the disciples on the way to Emmaus said exactly that all their hopes had been blasted by the crucifixion. At the discovery of the empty tomb one disposed to hallucination would immediately have jumped at the conclusion that the Master had risen from the dead. But the empty tomb merely suggests to Mary Magdalene the idea of the theft of the body, and after Peter verifies Mary's testimony, he is merely perplexed, for as St. John remarks (20:9), they did not yet know (i.e. understand) the Scriptures.

The steadfast refusal of Thomas to believe until he had direct evidence (Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the place of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe: Jn. 20:25), is not the way one psychologically disposed to hallucination would have acted. He would have eagerly, uncritically and unreservedly accepted the first intimation of the resurrection for which he had been longing. But the Apostles did not so act. The accounts of the empty tomb and the appearances brought by the holy women were treated as "idle tales," and were not believed (Lk. 24:11).

All the data we have, therefore, of the behavior and mental state of the holy women and the disciples who were recipients of the first appearances of the risen Lord, indicate that they were far from that mental state which is the necessary prelude to hallucination. Indeed, such was the psychic condition of the Apostles after the catastrophe of Calvary that it would have been psychologically impossible for them thirty-six hours later to suffer hallucinations and to pass almost instantaneously from a condition bordering on despair to a state of great spiritual exaltation in which they were firmly convinced that their Master had returned to life and had actually visited them, conversed with them and eaten with them.

---

[19] Mt. 16:21; 17:22; 20:17; and parallels.

As a further corroboration of our argument it should be noted that the Apostles knew well how to differentiate mere visions which came in the form of subjective, imaginary ideas from the genuine experience of objective reality.[20] Peter and Paul both had visions.[21] Paul had ecstatic experiences the exact nature of which he is unable to define.[22] Peter especially recognized the difference between ecstatic vision or purely mental communications of divine truth and the perception of objective reality. Thus after his release from prison by an angel, he first doubted whether it was an *ὅραμα* or *ἀληθές*. The terms used clearly mark the antithesis between what is objectively real and what is purely a subjective vision.[23] In spite of the abundance of visions which were, according to the prophecy of Joel, vouchsafed in Messianic times (Acts, 2:17), Peter never thought of basing his faith in the resurrection on these abnormal ecstatic experiences, which could not be scientifically checked and verified. On the contrary he appeals repeatedly to the testimony of eyewitnesses who, during their wakeful, fully conscious moments, had seen and heard and touched the risen Lord. Similarly Paul describes the appearances of our Lord to himself with the word *ἑόρακα* and *ὤφθη* construed with the dative, thus indicating a perception of an objective reality, and appealing to this perception as putting him on a par with the other apostles and qualifying him to be an apostle. At least six times does he appeal to having seen the Lord (Gal. 1:12,16; 1 Cor. 9:1; 15:8; Acts, 9:1f.; 22:4f.; 26: 9f.). Accordingly, although Peter and Paul had visions, they were not visionaries. Although they had ecstatic experiences, they knew how to distinguish visions and ecstatic experiences from the perception of reality with inexorable clearness and perfectly calm self-possession.

---

[20] Cf. Adam, *The Son of God,* Eng. Tr. Hereford. New York, 1934, p. 240f.

[21] Cf. Acts, 10:10f.; 12:7; 16:9; 2 Cor. 12:2. et alibi.

[22] "Whether in the body or out of the body I know not," i.e., he is unable to say whether his body had part in his ecstatic rapture or not, and whether the mysterious communications which were imparted to him came through the medium of the senses or not. So Allo, *Ep. aux Cor.* p. 305, Paris, 1937. Prat thinks that the vision was purely intellectual, since if the senses had any part in it Paul's doubt could not be explained. *Theology of St. Paul,* Tr. Stoddard. I, p. 158. New York, 1926.

[23] Cf. Jacquier, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris, 1926), p. 363.

The psychological impossibility of the Apostles' having suffered hallucinations thirty-six hours after the crucifixion of Jesus is generally recognized by the critics. But impossibilities which arise from the Gospel data create no difficulty for them whatever. They simply take their critical scalpel, and perform a literary appendectomy. They tell us blandly that what they remove is a later accretion to the primitive gospel story,—an appendix added to strengthen and bolster the apologetic argument in favor of the resurrection. Accordingly they deny that any apparitions took place on the third day after Christ's death. There is a click of their surgical scissors, and presto! a whole embarrassing section of the gospel records is gone. Then they proceed to perform a bit of literary plastic surgery. They take literary flesh and skin spun out of their own fancy and with scalpel in hand proceed to reconstruct the entire physiognomy of the gospel record to suit the exigencies of their own preconceived theories. They proceed as follows:[24] The influence which Jesus had exerted on His disciples was too deep to be possibly eliminated from their souls. They had indeed gone back to Galilee, yet had no longer been able to adapt themselves to the conditions of ordinary life. Some had remained with Peter, and it may be assumed that the eleven found themselves, later, again in Capharnaum or in its vicinity. In a life of leisure where a small catch of fish was sufficient to maintain them, thoughts of the past took possession of them, and their recollections were re-enkindled in their solitude. Hope had aroused them too powerfully for the calamity which had at first by the death of Jesus overwhelmed them, not to have given place to a mighty reaction... "What if the aid of the heavenly Father, which had not been bestowed on His anointed one during life, had been near Him at least in death? Ought one therefore despair of the kingdom of God? And if the kingdom was near, had not Jesus always His necessary part to play in it?" By such considerations, by ransacking the Scriptures, by secret meetings in which they sought to reanimate the faith of one another, they gradually developed the conviction that their Lord lived, and such a conviction passed readily into the ecstatic and visionary. Once the first visionary had seen the Lord, it was not long before all of His intimates began to have visions, until finally the number of those so favored reached the absolutely convincing number of five hundred.

---

[24] Lake, *Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 237ff. Loisy, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques*, I, 223. Strauss, *Leben Jesu für das Deutsche Volk*, I, 157. Cf. Felder, *op. cit.*, II, p. 405.

Thus is the plastic surgery completed, resulting in this new evangelical physiognomy according to which it is quite easy to accept the naturalistic explanation of the resurrection appearances of our God.

But once you admit the plastic surgery method of dealing with historical documents, then you have done with all history, and you are at the mercy of the speculations of philosophers whose only restraint is their personal judgment as to what is plausible or compatible with their preconceived philosophical tenets. We prefer to cling to history, and if our theories cannot be made to fit in with the established facts of history, then we prefer to alter our theories to fit the facts, instead of trying to alter the facts to fit the theories.

There now come up for consideration two objections against the thesis of the corporeal resurrection of Jesus Christ. The first is that His risen body was not subject to the laws of physics which govern our mortal bodies. He, with His mysterious risen body, was, for example, not recognizable even by His most intimate friends—such as Mary Magdalene and the Apostles. This body could pass through closed doors; it could render itself visible or invisible at will; it could, without the aid of any mechanical device such as the aeroplane, overcome the force of gravity, as it did at the ascension. Such a body, it would seem, is not a genuinely human body; it has an air of unreality about it; it seems to be fantastic; at least it is different from material bodies which come under human observation.

The second objection is based on St. Paul's categoric declaration that "flesh and blood cannot possess the Kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 15:50). But our Lord ascended into heaven with His risen body. Therefore it could not have been a body of flesh and blood.

We can answer these two difficulties *per modum unius.* In order to understand correctly St. Paul's assertion we must consider the entire passage in 1 Cor. 15. Having established the fact of the corporeal resurrection of man from numerous arguments, Paul proceeds to answer the difficulty: how can it be that the body, whose atoms at death have been scattered to the four corners of the globe, how can these atoms, dispersed and reassembled into a thousand new combinations, be gathered together again?[25] How can they be reassembled into one organic whole again, and what is to prevent their subsequent scattering or dispersion? In answering this difficulty St. Paul appeals first to the power of God as shown in an analogous operation of nature, the transformation which takes place in the seed-grain planted in the earth. It corrupts, or in the unscientific language of Paul, it dies, and from it there springs a new body. Unlimited is the variety of the plants,—flowers, shrubs and vegetables, which spring from these seeds, each with its own proper body. Now surely God, who can, through the operation of the ordinary laws of nature, produce such an astounding variety of vegetables, plants and flowers, can in the same way, from the body corrupting in the earth, produce a new—a different kind of body. To clinch the argument, St. Paul points to the great variety of bodies, each with its own specific kind of flesh, that of men, that of fish, that of beasts, and also to the great variety of heavenly bodies, sun, moon and stars.

It must be remembered that these are only analogies. The niceties of the science of biology, zoology or botany, did not concern St. Paul in the least, and hence we must not push the analogy too far. St. Paul does not, as Father Prat points out,[26] decide whether the seed and the plant have the same vital principle. His comparison refers only to the continuation of life after death. And if it be argued that the analogy is not true, since in the seed there is life, whereas in the corpse there is no life, we can answer with MacRory[27] that the corpse has an extrinsic principle of life, essentially ordinated to that body, and, moreover, there is the supernatural germ of life resulting from sanctifying grace and holy communion. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up in the last day" (Jn. 6:55). This is not, as remarks Allo,[28] an argument: it is simply an analogy or parallel, an example: in the case of the body, as of the grain, the subject persists but the attributes change—which implies a certain basic identity between the two, the grain-seed and the plant on the one hand, the corpse and the risen body on the other. The argument simply amounts to this: since God in His power produces such a great variety of bodies in the world of our experience, animals, fish, men, sun, moon, stars, each suited to its environment, it should not surprise us that He can produce, even though our imaginations, for lack of experience, cannot picture it, a body suited to the environment of heaven and capable of life unending, quite different in its characteristics from the wretched body which is ours now.

---

[25] Cf. Prat-Stoddard, *op. cit.* II, p. 138.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[27] *Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, St. Louis, 1915, p. 244.

Then St. Paul goes on to enumerate the qualities of this body:
1—it is sown in corruption; it rises in incorruption;
2—it is sown in dishonor; it rises in glory;
3—it is sown in weakness; it rises in power;
4—it is sown a natural (psychic) body: it rises a spiritual (pneumatic) body (1 Cor. 15:42-44).

In other words: the body which dies is subject to sickness, suffering, disease and death; the body which rises from death will be immune to these ills, free from death and all that can lead to death. It will in other words be endowed with impassibility.

The body which dies is dishonor: abject, vile, subject to the most humiliating necessities; after its resurrection it will be glorious, clothed with a beauty which reflects the beauty of the restored image of God and the brilliancy of the glorified soul.[29] This is what theologians call clarity.

The body which dies is weak, subject to all the limitations of time and space, liable at any time to lapse into sin owing to its infirmity and humiliating subjection to unruly passions, but when it rises it will be superior to the elements, the master of space, a victor over time. This is what theologians call agility.

Finally the body which before death was psychic or natural, will in the resurrection be spiritual or pneumatic, i.e. whereas before death it was subject to the natural soul, after the resurrection it will be perfectly submissive to the spirit, i.e. the highest part of the soul transformed in its qualities and operations by the presence of the Holy Spirit.[30] Some theologians refer to this as a fourth quality of the risen body, subtlety,[31] but others prefer to see in the term the summation of the three foregoing qualities.[32]

---

[28] *Op. cit.*, p. 422.

[29] Prat-Stoddard, *op. cit.*, I, p. 139.

Now one might readily suspect that such a body is entirely different from the body one has before death. No, it is identical in essence; only it is endowed with different qualities. It is rarified, spiritualized,[33] sublimated, but it is substantially the same body. St. Paul's language leaves no room for doubt on this point. *This* corruptible body, he says, must put on incorruption, and *this* mortal body must put on immortality (1 Cor. 15:53). Elsewhere he writes: "And if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, He that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, shall quicken (*ζωοποιήσει*, i.e. make alive) also your mortal bodies" (Rom. 8:11). The transformation of the body in the general resurrection is called "quickening" (making to live). In Philippians, 3:21 the change is called "transformation." He "will reform (*μετασχηματίσει*, which designates an accidental change)[34] the body of our lowness, made like to the body of His glory, according to the operation whereby also he is able to subdue all things unto Himself."

---

[30] Allo, *op. cit.*, p. 425.

[31] St. Thomas in his *Summa*, IIIae Sup., in four questions (LXXXII-LXXXV) treats the properties of the risen body under four heads.

[32] For example MacRory, *op. cit.*, p. 246, thinks the "spiritual" is not a fourth quality but a summation of the three preceding. Corluy, *Spicilegium Dogmaticum,* I, p. 322 explains "spiritual" as follows: "Corpus videlicet nullis amplius alimentis, nullo somno, nulla generatione, nullis vitalium facultatum functionibus indigens, sed animae summa obtemperandi facultate attemperatum."

[33] The words "rarefied, spiritualized" should be used with caution in reference to the glorified body. St. Thomas objects: "Quidam haeretici dixerunt, ... quod corpus in resurrectione habebit subtilitatem secundum modum rarefactionis; ita quod corpora humana in resurrectione erunt aërea, vel vento similia ... sed hoc etiam stare non potest ... quidam haeretici... attribuerunt eis subtilitatem secundum modum, quo spirituales substantiae dicuntur, dicentes quod in resurrectione corpus vertetur in spiritum ... Sed hoc stare non potest." IIIae Sup. LXXXIII, 1. Subsequently Thomas defines this subtlety as consisting "in dominio animae glorificatae, quae est forma corporis, super ipsum, ratione cujus corpus gloriosum spirituale dicitur, quasi omnino spiritui subjectum." *Ibid.*

[34] This word is significant. It "signifies the change of the outward fashion, the sensible vesture in which the human spirit is clothed." Vincent: *International Critical Commentary on Philippians,* p. 120, New York,

There is therefore identity of underlying substance; only the properties of the body will be changed. Yet it would be a mistaken notion of Paul's doctrine to regard this body as ethereal or aerial. It is not like the celestial spirits in its manner of being and acting,[35] for then it would not be a body at all. The risen body retains its corporality, its materiality, but it is so transformed in its properties as to be unlike any body which has ever come under human observation, save the glorified body of the risen Lord.

Of course all this is, as St. Paul tells us, a mystery. "Behold, I tell you a mystery" (1 Cor. 15:50). Consequently we should not be surprised if the description of the glorified body which Paul gives is beyond our experience and the power of our imaginations to picture. Mysteries are always somewhat disconcerting; otherwise they would not be mysteries.

Yet St. Paul was not merely speculating, not merely giving us the content of a revelation he had received from heaven. He and the other Apostles had had direct experience of the risen body's properties in the case of our Lord, and from that experience he and they conclude to the properties of the risen, glorified body in general.

From the foregoing it should be clear what St. Paul means when he says that flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of heaven. The statement is perfectly clear from what follows: "neither can corruption inherit incorruption." That simply means that flesh and blood as we know them in our present bodies, subject to disease, death and disintegration, cannot inherit heaven. It does not at all mean, as Lake interprets it,[36] that

---

1898. There is, however, some loose, inexact language used by the author in explaining this verse. Lightfoot, quoted by Grimm's Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti, sub voce,* says: *μετασχηματίζω* would here refer to the transient condition from which, *μεταμορφόω* to the permanent state to which, the change takes place. Abp. Trench, however, supposes that *μετασχηματίζω* is here preferred to *μεταμορφόω* as expressing "transition but no absolute solution of continuity," the spiritual body being developed from the natural as the butterfly from the caterpillar.

[35] Prat-Stoddard, *op. cit.,* I, p. 139.

[36] *Op. cit.,* p. 27, 220f.

the glorified body is to be incorporeal, in other words not a real body at all.

Now we are in a position to answer the objection about the peculiar behavior or operations of our Lord's glorified body. It was all due to the fact that it had the peculiar properties of the risen body as set forth by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 15. These properties also explain why the familiars of our Lord did not always immediately recognize Him. The risen body, says Père Lagrange, has not the familiar appearance of every day life.[37] And St. Mark expressly declares that our Lord after His resurrection appeared "in another shape" (Mk. 16:12). This, however, should not surprise us, for even before His death, during His earthly sojourn before His glorification, similar sudden transformations or outward changes in the appearance of our Lord took place, and He at times withdrew his body from the laws of nature.[38]

Thus I believe the theory that the resurrection appearances of our Lord were hallucinations has been adequately and convincingly for any fair mind rejected. In a subsequent article we hope to discuss the conversion of St. Paul and his testimony to the resurrection of our Lord.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

St. Mary's Seminary
Perryville, Missouri

---

[37] *S. Luc.*, p. 603, Paris, 1921.

[38] Cf. the transfiguration, Mt. 17:1 and parallels; walking on the water, Jn. 6:19; escape from the mob which sought to kill Him: Jn. 8:59; 7:30, 44; 8:20; 18:6. Lk. 4:30. Some see in these escapes of our Lord a miracle, while others are not so ready to acknowledge the miraculous element. Cf. Lagrange, *S. Luc.*, p. 130; Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 120.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN OUR COLLEGES

The College student has and holds an emphatic integral part in the realization of the intentions of Benedict XV expressed in the Encyclical *Spiritus Paraclitus:* "Hence, as far as in us lies, we, Venerable Brethren, shall, with St. Jerome as our guide, never desist from urging the faithful to read daily the Gospels, the Acts and the Epistles, so as to gather food for their souls."[1] These words of the Vicar of Christ are only the timely expression of an idea regarding the Scriptures persistent throughout the long age of the Church. In the patristic era, the beauty thereof culminates in the lovely Augustinian "Tolle et lege." St. Francis has left us a medieval memory of it in his fatherly letter to all the Friars: "I warn all my brothers and I strengthen them in Christ, wheresoever they may find the divine written words to venerate them so far as they are able.... For many things are sanctified by the word of God."[2] And thus the flower of youth in our own day should have these writings entrusted to them, that they may emulate the great Timothy, who was reminded by an inspired Paul: "For from thy infancy thou hast known the Sacred Writings, which are able to instruct thee unto salvation by faith, which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. 3:15).

Thoughts such as these focus our attention upon the average knowledge about the Sacred Writings amongst the young whom we consider most adequately instructed, Catholic College students. Certainly they are acquainted with the New Testament in its several parts; but that least common denominator of sound familiarity, a good reading knowledge, is indeed hopelessly lacking. The remedy is at hand by capitalizing upon the new interest that the appearance of the Confraternity text has awakened. That is precisely the objective of this paper. It is fully within the realm of the practical as its term, even though its presentation may seem vague theorizing because so much of it exists in the order of intention. In any case, a planned course in the reading of the New Testament is the only thing that can bring about the desideratum in our Catholic academic world of demonstrating that the Scriptures really are "useful for teaching, reproving, for correcting, for instructing in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, equipped for every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16). For that reason, a complete reading of the New Testament within the framework of the existing collegiate Religion course is herewith proposed as a possibility for the forty-week scholastic year of two credit hours a semester. Because the course is obviously synthetic, the time element is an important feature underlying its psychological aim. The student should have a sense of completeness in the consciousness of at least having seen all of the New Testament. Naturally, the spectre of superficiality about "certain things difficult to understand, which the unlearned and the unstable distort" (2 Pet. 3:16), haunts the endeavor. Yet this is readily dispelled if we fully appreciate the light of learning that should be flickering in the minds of the readers, whose experience it will be to appreciate the things that are actually difficult to explain and the persistent need for proper guidance.

---

[1] *Enchiridion Biblicum* n. 490—English translation from Steinmueller, J. E., *A Companion to Scripture Study* (New York: Wagner, 1941), p. 446.

[2] Robinson, Paschal, O.F.M. *The Writings of St. Francis* (Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1916), p. 116.

This course of planned reading is conceived as to best advantage for Senior College because it will then be supplementary to the precious intensive indoctrination that will have taken place. Again, such scholars are readily familiar with the dogmatic implications particularly underlying the phraseology of the Epistles. Besides, we dare to hope that this will give the student the initiative for continuing a life-work of daily New Testament reading. There is the alternative of proposing it as introductory in Sophomore Religion, wherein the synthetic character of the reading will have the advantage of successive professors adequately treating the isolated texts as they appear in the ordered doctrinal material pursued in the following two years. Yet this has its limitations, and not the least is the lack of doctrinal perspective upon which the professor can presume.

The students are undergraduate and therefore under formation. In spite of the varied scholastic mentality that will be concerned, with the proper approach the professor can engage the natural inquisitiveness of this type of student. And inherent in the course to be outlined is the sense of comprehensiveness which adequately meets this demand; the student gradually gaining the feeling of "being in the know" as far as the New Testament is concerned.

The greater part of the knowledge content expected from the course largely depends upon the deductive values underlying the method of presentation. That is why sequence in reading the several parts of the New Testament plays such an important part. But we must first clarify objectives.

The New Testament is a body of literature that can be treated in the nature of a world classic, an historical record, a religious document, which equally suggest an aesthetic approach, an historical approach, or a doctrinal approach, divisions of objective general enough to include all possible attitudes. Literary values are apt to control the first in adapting a sequence of reading; chronological interests will determine the second; while dogma will dominate the third. The actual sequence in our Confraternity text is a product of St. Jerome that seems to have been prompted first by chronological interests and then proportional dignity of the recipients of the several Epistles. This explains the need of adopting a working sequence for any planned reading.

AESTHETIC APPROACH. Suggesting a sequence of reading that would convey the aesthetic values of the New Testament is difficult and practically needless here because of the psychological and philological limitations in the ordinary undergraduate student. Fundamentally it is also a question of dealing with words infinite in content and finite in structure, with the linguistic features laboring in translation. The constant appeal to the beauty of the "original" would weaken the objective in a college course. Moreover, the art of criticism so necessary for adequate classical appreciation would be wholly lost. Thus it is, that the sound reading knowledge we would have is rather to be expected from a doctrinal or historical approach.

DOCTRINAL APPROACH. Certainly any reading is favorable to simultaneous indoctrination or apologetical appeal. To be successfully conducted, however, the sequence of reading must necessarily be "thematic." Selection of themes depends upon too many factors that would allow no more than a generalization for this discussion. As demonstrable, however, the following themes lend themselves to fine adaptation for a consecutive reading of the New Testament.

(a) Nothing is more essential than tracing the complete personality of Christ by pursuing the following sequence: The Gospels as the Revelation of Christ in Himself; the Acts as the Revelation of Christ in the Church; the Epistles as demonstrative of Christ in the soul; the Apocalypse revealing Christ in Heaven. It matters little the order of reading the constituents of these four great divisions; here the originality of the Professor can have full play.

(b) The Church is a satisfying theme wherein the Gospels reveal its foundation, the Acts bespeak its expansion, the Epistles declare the effects of that Church in the world and in souls, whilst the Apocalypse demonstrates its fulfillment on earth and in heaven.

(c) Other themes that could be suggested might concern a scheme demonstrative of the Sacramental System, a liturgical sequence adapted to the scholastic year in seasonal cycle as far as possible, the Mystical Body, the doctrine of Grace.

This doctrinal approach is indeed engaging, but it extends the term "reading knowledge" and tries to accomplish too much. It is not apostolic pedagogy to feed men with solid food before they are ready for it. Moreover, such planned reading is apt to betray artificiality, a thing which makes the undergraduate student wary; their experience is too elementary for them to estimate the strength of cumulative argument proving a thesis. They incline to suspect bias and gain only a thematic understanding of the New Testament. After all, we must be true to the Baconian principle "reading maketh a full man." While the sequence of reading will be normal as it stands in the Vulgate arrangement for the most part, the student will gradually tire of the repetitious elements that are bound to be emphasized in thematic reading—it cannot escape these features.

HISTORICAL APPROACH. It is already apparent that the historical approach is most satisfactory for the objective of inculcating a reading knowledge to a college student. The latter would then realize that the New Testament in his hands is a living document, meaning something to the present, reaching back into the past, and looking forward to the future. Certainly he will be appreciative of the reality of it as he is gradually enlightened regarding where, when, and how this book means so much to Christianity and the Catholic faith. Therefore his reading plan will rather follow an historical progression from the "book of the origin" to the mention of reward for "those who keep the words of this book" (Apoc. 22:9). Chronology becomes the determinative factor in establishing the sequence of reading together with selective grouping. This will include the advantage of discovery for the student wherein he will realize how very occasional the Scripture literature really is, and why it is but only part of the deposit of faith. Furthermore, because the reading will be likewise selective, he will recognize in the New Testament that the several parts while independent in origin, character, and objective, are none the less interdependent, due to the great fact of being the "word of God" throughout all its parts and for all places and for all time.

The sequence of reading that would seem most compelling is herewith schematically presented:

FIRST SEMESTER

- Gospel of S. Luke (S. Paul)
- Acts of the Apostles
- Epistles of S. Paul
    - 1 & 2 Thessalonians
    - Galatians
    - 1 & 2 Corinthians
    - Romans
    - Philippians
    - Ephesians
    - Colossians
    - Philemon
    - Hebrews
    - 1 Timothy
    - Titus
    - 2 Timothy

SECOND SEMESTER

- Gospel of S. Matthew
- Gospel of S. Mark (S. Peter)
    - Epistles of S. Peter
    - Epistle of S. James
    - Epistle of S. Jude
- Gospel of S. John (S. John)
    - Epistles of S. John
    - Apocalypse

There is scarcely need of expounding the qualities of Luke as introductory for this historical approach inasmuch as his Gospel is intentionally the "orderly account" (Lk. 1:4). In isolating this one Gospel, that fatigue is avoided which would naturally arise from a steady perusal of the Synoptics. Moreover, Luke is favourable to sequence of authorship as well as historic fact. His intimacy with St. Paul sets up a natural progression to the actual word of that great Apostle who so thoroughly dominates the New Testament.

The Epistles of St. Paul are presented to the reader in an accepted chronology of their sporadic appearance. That of Ruffini[3] has been adopted merely for convenience; the professor may have his own ideas regarding that problem. But the student is still within the historic line when he gains the appreciation of handling these sacred documents as they proceeded from the missionary endeavour of the Apostle of the Gentiles. This program of reading would easily be a semester's work depending upon the assignment and class method of the individual professor, though semester division need not be an absolute consideration in this course.

---

[3] Ruffini, E., *Chronologia Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, (Rome: 1924), p. 205.

The second part of this reading course would begin with St. Matthew's Gospel and be followed by that of Mark. Here there is indeed repetition but this consecutiveness should awaken in the student a consciousness of what the Synoptic problem implies. Moreover, the position of Mark in this sequence can convey his intimacy with St. Peter and establish the logical attention the latter's Epistles demand. While not exactly absolute chronology, the Epistles of James and Jude are products of the famous decennial 60-70 A.D. and therefore an admissible sequence.

The writings of St. John constitute the remainder of this reading program. Reading the Gospel of the Beloved Disciple at this stage cannot but emphasize its character of complement to the sacred writings that have gone before. As a matter of fact, the student is ready for a theological history of Christ because he understands that the Christian community, familiar with some of the literature he himself has just read, would expect and would find St. John to be pointedly supplementary. It is then that the alluring doctrine of love is enhanced in the Epistles of St. John. There is nothing more final than the golden prophecy of the Apocalypse, an end that ought to be truly the beginning of searching the Scriptures that speak of Him. In any case, a wide historical and, we hope, a religious perspective will have been opened to the mind of the reader in the first handling and seeing of this pearl of great price.

Objectives, while they are the ends to be obtained, are and still will be in the realm of the ideal until we propose the means to those ends. Cognizant of the fact that we have a book of some 750 pages to be covered within the framework of forty class-hours, the average assignment ought to be some fifteen to twenty pages. These statistics are only presented to gauge the possibility and practicality of the proposed reading plan; they are not intended as absolute because this will vary with circumstances that are outside our discussion and more within the province of ability, responsiveness, background of the individual classes.

There are three methods that give us a latitude of accomplishment as well as a survey of the possibility of integrating this into the average college religion course.

PROFESSORIAL READING. The professor assigns the preparative reading to be done outside class. In conducting the reading course his is the duty of reading in class what he can or what he thinks demonstrative. The value of this method lies wholly in the personality of the professor, his tone of voice (which can be fatal), as well as the validity of his authority and scholarly appreciativeness. Conscience is the test whether the professor has the ability and therefore the right to conduct this kind of class reading.

STUDENT READING. This method consists of consecutive reading out loud by each student, interspersed with socratic questioning that will draw the attention of the student to focal points. However, it is constantly subject to the weakness of poor readers and the insufficiency of knowledge that the socratic questioning might reveal. This in turn is liable to discourage the average student gradually disheartening him with the feeling that the Scriptures are like any other school-task.

CO-OPERATIVE READING. The success of this method depends upon a capable division of labor. The professor will search out the readers; they are always a natural group and quickly declare themselves. They should have the assignment of preparatory reading for an intelligent rendition of the text in class. A second section of the group would have the duty of paraphrasing the class reading. The professor can avail himself of this paraphrase for a preliminary to the actual text-reading, or as supplementary for clarifying obscurities that are likely to occur in the general reading. For a third section there would be the task of having a knowledge of the strange expressions and words, upon which the professor can and should properly elaborate. Naturally this co-operative reading would function best in the smaller units; with collegiate classes averaging sixty participants, the method will obtain on a proportional 15-20 division for the respective assignments.

In all methods we should ever have in mind that we are trying to convey the spirit of this wonderful handiwork of God. The readers whom we aim to direct should continually be alert to the fact that this is the word of God and consequently timeless. For that reason, the professor will elucidate the circumstances with accompanying demonstrative items from Archaeology, History, Geography, Visual aids, etc. Frequently there will be need of paralleling the facts from everyday occurrence in modern life. Such intangible elements, however, ultimately must come from the individual genius and character of the professor.

The literal sense is the fundament of this general reading. The excellent notes accompanying the Confraternity text assure the reader of this. It remains for the professor to confirm this literal sense in the minds of his students. In undertaking a course as extensive as this the consequence of first impressions is a factor that must be duly weighed. For that reason, the New Testament is not to be humanized, but rather the divine in it should ever be obvious. Beware of moralizing too much; let the text rather speak for itself.

There can be little doubt that our collegiate world would greatly profit from a reading knowledge of the New Testament. We seduously train them in the world classics demanding a general reading knowledge as basic, even entrusting to them the potentialities of interpretation. The one literature that can and should interest the Catholic in its entirety, however, is largely an unknown quantity. Certainly a planned reading of the New Testament can hardly be a dangerous knowledge. We all admit the impelling power of the word of God and sooner or later our Catholic students will be alive to this same fact if they can but see for themselves that this word of God is really "living and efficient and keener than any two-edged sword, and extending even to the division of soul and spirit, of joints also and of marrow, and a discerner of thoughts and intentions of the heart" (Heb. 4:12). They must not be outside that beautiful prayer we pray daily at Mass: "Per evangelica dicta deleantur nostra delicta."

EUSTACE J. SMITH, O.F.M.

St. Bonaventure Seminary
St. Bonaventure, New York

SACRED SCRIPTURE AND THE THEOLOGY COURSE[1]

The solicitude of the Catholic Hierarchy in the United States which prompted and promoted a renewed interest in the study of the Scriptures is signalized by the revision of the New Testament. At the Congress of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine held in Philadelphia in November, approval and acclaim marked this achievement of the recently organized Catholic Biblical Association.

But in the encouraging review of what has been accomplished there is the evidence of much yet to be done for the promotion of Scripture study among Catholics. The sessions of the Congress devoted to this problem were concerned with the stimulation of interest among the laity. Surely the prayer of the Holy Father was realized, for one could not but be touched by the "flame of zeal and inspiration manifested for the continuance of this apostolic labor of the Confraternity."

In this circumstance the problem discussed in its first session by the Biblical Association was most timely, interesting especially to those who strive to enkindle a love of God's word in the heart of seminarians. For if the people and society are to learn to know God from the study of the Scriptures, what of the teachers who are sent to the people? The discussion granted some warrant to the judgment that in our seminaries we do not use the Bible sufficiently in our theological course. The aim of the discussion was to arrive at some solution which would further the realization of a desire expressed by Bishop Carroll in his address at last year's Meeting in Toronto: "If," said the Bishop, "our seminary course is crowded, let it be crowded with exegesis." (Cf., *C.B.Q.* Vol. II, p. 288.)

The Most Rev. Ralph L. Hayes, Rector of the North American College in Rome, presided over the first session of the Meeting in the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel. The Most Reverend Bishop opened the session with a prayer and introduced Father John P. Weisengoff, D.D., S.S.L., of the Catholic University of America, who was the discussion leader.

---

[1] A summary of the proceedings at the first session of the Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association held in Philadelphia, Pa. on Nov. 15, 1941.

Father Weisengoff presented the topic of discussion "Sacred Scripture and the Theology Course." He resolved the subject into three questions, thus indicating the course by which the discussion might proceed:—1. What is the place of Scripture in the study of Dogma and Moral; i.e., in the dogmatic education of the Seminarian, should the scriptural basis of revealed doctrine be more positively presented and more fully considered, with less emphasis on the speculative development of revealed doctrine? 2. How much positive consideration of the revealed truth contained in Sacred Scripture does the student receive in our Theological Course? 3. What, then, is to be done?

The discussion leader indicated the importance of Sacred Scripture as a source of Catholic Doctrine, asserting that all revealed truth is contained in Tradition and Scripture. The ensuing questions introduced by Fr. Tennant developed the Catholic attitude toward Scripture as a remote rule of Faith, which, as a source of revelation, needs an authentic interpretation. Since the Sacred Text is susceptible of various interpretations, it is a source of revealed doctrine not as interpreted by the individual but as understood and explained by the Church, the divinely appointed Teacher, equipped with the fullness of doctrine contained in divine Apostolic Tradition.

Defining positive theology as the science which shows "quod verum sit," and speculative as the form of theology which demonstrates "quomodo verum sit," the discussion leader dwelt on the tendency of the human mind to be occupied with the question of "how this can be true." Consequently, he observed, there has been an emphasis on and a devotion of much time to speculative consideration in our theology courses. The criticism which followed was aimed at a system epitomized in dogmatic text-books which devote pages to the arguments from reason and crowd the scriptural argument into a few lines or verses, verses which are excised too callously from a context that deserves very often the feeling judgment of a Solomon. Some saw need in this condition for some form of coordination of the Theological sciences so that Scripture, as the soul of theology, might restore a unity the theological course (Benedict XV, *Spiritus Paraclitus,* 496).

Father Weisengoff turned attention to the theological schools of Alexandria and Antioch, where "there was little taught (in matic theology we may properly describe as a newcomer, far removed from the source whence Catholic doctrine has been derived—the stream of pure waters which St. Jerome describes, the stream of Holy Scripture which flows from the throne of God, the one stream that is the Grace of the Holy Spirit. Father Plassmann suggested a solution in the co-ordination of the work done in Scripture class with that done in the Dogmatic class. As far as possible the work of the two classes might be synchronized so that the Dogma professor is treating de Deo Creante, while the Scripture professor treats of Genesis: de Verbo Incarnato while he treats of the Gospels: de Gratia while he explains the Epistles. Thus the proper relationship of Scripture with the Dogmatic course may be restored. Then we may hope that the student will be touched and warmed by an enthusiasm like to St. John's, arising from a realization of the divine nature of what he has seen. "I write," he says, "of what was from the beginning, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we have looked upon and our hands have handled: of the Word of Life."

The limitation of time prevented a full discussion of other suggested ways of restoring Scripture to its proper place in the Theological Course. Attention was pointed to some theological schools in Europe where the course is traditionally positive, i.e. where the scriptural basis of dogma is more thoroughly considered.

The President of the Biblical Association closed the discussion with the observation that the interest evidenced is a promise of results to come. And what results may come most probably will be from a breaking down of the barrier dividing the department of the Dogmatic professor from that of the Scripture professor.

The sentiment of the session is that expressed so directly by Leo XIII (*P.D.*, 99) "that the whole teaching of theology be pervaded and animated by the use of the divine Word of God. That is what the Fathers and the greatest theologians of all ages have desired and reduced to practice. It is chiefly out of the sacred writings that they endeavored to proclaim and establish the Articles of Faith and the truths therewith connected, and it was in them, together with divine tradition, that they found the refutation of heretical error and the reasonableness, the true meaning, and the mutual relation of the truths of Catholicism.

Nor will anyone wonder at this who considers that the sacred books hold such an eminent position among the sources of revelation that without their assiduous study and use theology cannot be placed on a true footing, or treated as its dignity demands."

The session was adjourned by Father Byrne and closed with a prayer by the Most Reverend Bishop.

JOSEPH O'DONNELL, S.S.L.

Mount St. Mary's Seminary
Emmitsburg, Md.

those schools) but what was contained in the reading, the interpretation, and the defense of the divine written word." The Bible was the text book of the Fathers of the Church. The theological schools were schools of exegesis. The writings of the Fathers were, in the main, Commentaries on the Scriptures. When Aristotelian speculation was introduced into the West in the Middle Ages, a new turn was given to the curriculum of theological schools. Attention was diverted from a direct and total consideration of the revealed truths contained in the Scriptures. The schools were no longer concerned directly with what Scripture said but with the effort to synthesize the body of revealed truth into a logical system, to fill out the totality of Catholic doctrine by conclusions derived from the given premises.

Father Tennant called attention to factors other than the Scriptures which contributed to the formation of the Fathers, e.g. the influence of Plato in that "golden age of biblical exegesis," an influence marked especially in the thought of St. Augustine. Father Stapleton referred to the importance of Patristics in an adequate Theological course. The instance he cited of a two year course of 5 hours per week was recognized as exceptional. In fact, general opinion conceded that the course of Patristics in our Seminaries is mostly biographical. Father McHugh called attention to the analytical principle described by Leo XIII in reference to the authority of the interpretation of the Fathers: "the Holy Fathers... are of *supreme authority*" when their unanimity evinces that such interpretation has come down from the apostles as a matter of Catholic Faith. But "the opinion of the Fathers is also of very *great weight*... because they are men of eminent sanctity and of ardent zeal for the truth, on whom God has bestowed a more ample measure of His light."

The anxious endeavor of the recent Pontiffs to give a new impulse to Scripture study was introduced into the discussion by Father Weisengoff. From the Encyclical Letters *Providentissimus Deus* of Leo XIII and *Spiritus Paraclitus* of Benedict XV we have the Roman Pontiffs voicing a long cherished "desire to give an impulse to the noble science of Holy Scripture" (*P.D.*, 67). "Most desirable is it, and most essential, that the whole teaching of theology be pervaded and animated by the use of the divine Word of God" (*P.D.*, 99). From words of Benedict XV asserting the desirability of "Scripture indeed becoming the very soul of theology," Father Cummins took occasion to note how St. Thomas speaks of Theology and Scripture without distinction. There can be, he suggested, no adequate separation of dogmatic theology from Scripture, no complete separation of speculative theology from the positive science. If we would speak of a distinct body of which Scripture is the soul, that body might be Church History or some other related branch of the curriculum, but certainly the relation of Dogma and Scripture admits no such clear-cut separation.

This close relationship of Dogmatic Theology and Scripture naturally introduced into the discussion the criticism of the method which is followed in our theology course. Fathers Coleran and Hodous voiced the need of closer collaboration between the departments of Dogma and Scripture. The conclusions arrived at in the Scripture class on questions of interpretation in this regard will only confuse and disturb the student. The criticism suggested by Father Weisengoff sums up the turn of the discussion: "Sacred Scripture in the Theology course is handled too frequently by theologians with a decidedly philosophical bent. Hence the scriptural foundations of dogma are not given the emphasis they deserve." Father McConnell vouched for this criticism as voicing the sentiment of a prominent member of one of the theological faculties in Rome. "St. Thomas himself would lament to see the *Summa* emphasized at the expense of the Bible."

The history of the present subordinate condition of Sacred Scripture in the theological course was sketched by Father Plassmann. With a pleasant eloquence and erudition he described how the separate departments of the theological faculties became self-conscious in the sixteenth century. Until the middle ages Theology and Scripture constituted one discipline. Evidences of the tendency to separate the two and to relegate Scripture to a place of secondary importance are found in the complaints of St. Bonaventure, Don Scotus and Roger Bacon. In the Schools we begin to see the Masters and Doctors burdened with *Summae* and *Summulae* while on their way to the Assembly Hall. The Bible had to make room for other text books, the Compendium of Peter Comestor, the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, the *Decretum* of Gratian. The fruit of this process we witness today, grown to full bloom in text books and courses where theology is purely and proudly speculative. And such a development of dogbetter, St. Paul thinks, at the present stage of the unfolding of his doctrine and in view of their spiritual infancy, to characterize their relation to God in terms of human slavery. Later on he will speak of the relation of sons (Rom. 8:14), and a time may come in their spiritual growth when he can say, as St. Augustine was to say later: *Ama et fac quod vis.*

This, it seems, is what St. Paul means when he says that he is speaking in a human way because of the weakness of their flesh. This weakness, although it is radically in the flesh, reacts on their spiritual faculties, clouding their intellects and weakening their wills.[1]

For as you yielded your members as slaves of uncleanness and iniquity unto iniquity, so now yield your members as slaves of justice unto sanctification.

The *for* connects this with verse 18. There St. Paul states that they have become the slaves of Justice. He now explains in what that complete service of Justice consists: in yielding one's members to the service of Justice with the same complete dedication as formerly they were given over entirely to the service of Sin. Origen well explains what it means to yield one's members as slaves of Justice or of Sin:

> Formerly your feet sped you to the temples of demons; let them now take you to the Church of God. Formerly they hastened to the shedding of blood; now let them run to the sparing of blood. Formerly your hands were stretched forth to steal; now let them be engaged in dispensing alms. Formerly your eyes wandered about and rested on a woman or another's property to lust after them; now let them be directed to the poor, the weak, the wretched, to compassionate them. Your ears were then amused with vain speech or calumnies; now let them be opened to hear the word of God. . . .

The Roman Christians were in their pagan days slaves of uncleanness, i.e., all manner of shameful sensual indulgence (Cf. Rom. 1:24-32). Impurity, as an evil master, dominated and ruled them with the utmost tyranny, and as its aid and abetter it had at its side injustice, i.e., utter lawlessness, the complete absence of any moral restraint whatever. Submission to these slave-drivers, not an unpleasant thing at the moment to the creature of sense, gradually led to the formation of a gripping habit until presently the indulgence of sensuality and this complete freedom from moral restraint became a second nature to them. This is what the Apostle means when he says that they yielded their members as slaves of uncleanness and iniquity *unto iniquity.*

---

[1] Others, notably Origen and St. John Chrysostom, interpret the words in the sense of a precept which is proportioned to their weakness. Thus Origen: "What is so human, so light, so free from burden, and such as no human weakness can excuse (as to render at least as much service to justice as formerly one gave to sin)? To a much greater degree and with much greater intensity should justice be honored."

By the bountiful grace of God the converts at Rome had been rescued from that shameful and degrading servitude; and now St. Paul would have them render an equally complete service to Justice, i.e. holiness of life. They are to cherish and strive to realize to the full the ideals of the Christian life which the Gospel had set before them. They are to strive after purity, sobriety, justice, charity towards their fellow-man, unselfishness and all the other Christian virtues. This loyal obedience leads ultimately to sanctification, to the state of holiness or complete consecration of self to God. This result is not entirely achieved all at once; it is a progressive process whose ultimate term is utter sanctity, complete union with God and absolute surrender of self to the divine will.

For when you were the slaves of sin, you were free as regards justice.

This gives the reason why St. Paul exhorts his readers to complete surrender of self to the service of God. They were once in total thraldom to Sin; It was the only master they recognized. No other was allowed any claim on them. The demands of Justice meant nothing to them; were completely ignored by them. Heed was given and obedience yielded only to the demands of Sin. The Apostle has in mind the slave who is the exclusive property of one master alone; no other has any jurisdiction over him; no other has any right to issue a command. It is a practical application of our Lord's dictum: No man can serve two masters. The two masters in this case are Sin and Justice.

The Apostle is asking for a complete *volte-face.* Sin is to be replaced by Justice, and the submission so slavishly and so fully rendered formerly to Sin is now to be given absolutely and completely to Justice. He requests complete conversion, utter abandonment of the one master, in order to adhere to the other, as formerly the Roman converts were free from Justice and slaves to Sin, now they are to be just as free from Sin and just as complete henchmen of Justice.

EXPOSITION OF THE MISSAL EPISTLES FROM ROMANS

IV

The following passage from the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans is the lesson read in the Mass for the seventh Sunday after Pentecost:

> 6:19 I speak in a human way because of the weakness of
> your flesh; for as you yielded your members as slaves
> of uncleanness and iniquity unto iniquity, so now yield
> your members as slaves of justice unto sanctification.
> 20 For when you were the slaves of sin, you were free as
> 21 regards justice. But what fruit had you then from
> those things of which you are now ashamed? For the
> 22 end of these things is death. But now set free from
> sin and become slaves to God, you have your fruit unto
> 23 sanctification, and as your end life everlasting. For
> the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is life
> everlasting in Christ Jesus our Lord.

This passage occurs in a section of the Epistle which St. Paul devotes to convincing the Roman converts to Christianity—evidently from Paganism, not from Judaism—that there can properly be no place for Sin in the Christian plan for living, and to persuading them to have done with Sin once and for all. Sin is personified by the Apostle, and designates all the allurements to evil which are familiarly summed up under the three heads: the world, the flesh and the Devil. Sin is pitted against its antagonist, Justice or Holiness, vying with it for the allegiance of man.

The Apostle's first argument, explained in the October, 1941, issue of the *Quarterly,* is that through Baptism the Christian dies with Christ to Sin and rises to a new life (Rom. 6:1-11). This is followed by an exhortation that he free himself from the domination of Sin, and not hand over his members as weapons to fight the battles of Sin, but rather dedicate them to a holy warfare for God. As a reason for this complete change of allegiance the Apostle declares that the Christian is no longer under the Law but under grace. The old regime in which the Law merely pointed out the way man was to go and like highway signs did nothing more than that, supplying no inner energy to man to enable him to progress along that way, has given place to the regime or system of grace, which, while proposing a lofty ideal of living to man, also rehabilitates him interiorly, enlightening his darkened mind and strengthening his weakened will, thus furnishing the inner energy which makes him equal to the lofty standard of holy living which Christianity proposes (Rom. 6:12-14).

The Apostle, however, feared that his declaration that we are no longer under the Law would be misunderstood. "Shall we not sin freely," his readers might argue, "because we are no longer under the Law; do as we please without restraint?" Thus they would consider themselves justified in absolute libertinage. This of course would be a fatal misunderstanding of St. Paul's views. The cessation of the old ties does not mean the removal of all ties; it involves the substitution of new obligations in place of the old. St. Paul emphatically rejects the false inference on the ground that a man cannot serve two masters, Sin and Justice. It must be either the one or the other that claims man's allegiance. There can be no compromise. He pleads with the Roman Christians that they yield the same unqualified service to Justice which formerly as pagans they had yielded to Sin (Rom. 6:15-18).

The Apostle bases his plea on the respective immediate and ultimate results of serving these two masters. Of the service of Sin there is no worthwhile immediate result. Animal pleasure and sense gratification indeed there are, but this is something the man enlightened by Christian faith and ideals blushes to recall. And the ultimate result is eternal death. On the contrary the service of Justice, i.e., of God, has its immediate fruit in holiness, and its final result in life everlasting. This plea is contained in the passage which forms the lesson for the seventh Sunday after Pentecost (6:19-23).

I speak in a human way because of the weakness of your flesh.

In his manner of speech and the analogies he uses the Apostle takes into account that his readers are as yet but spiritual children, morally and intellectually undeveloped, liable to misunderstand and misinterpret his words should he speak of their relation to God in Christianity as that of sons. As he had written before to the Corinthians: "I could not speak to you as to spiritual men but only as carnal, as to little ones in Christ. I fed you with milk and not with solid food" (1 Cor. 3:1-2). It is whatever we do in this union with Him takes on, to a certain extent, the dignity and the worth of our Blessed Savior's surpassing excellence. Thus our actions proceeding from grace are proportioned to the reward of supernatural life and become meritorious in the supernatural order.

For this reason, then, St. Paul can correctly speak at times of eternal life as a gift, viewing it in the light of the initial gratuitous endowment of grace bestowed on us. At other times he can correctly refer to it as a wage or recompense, viewing our actions as they proceed from grace which ennobles and supernaturalizes them. Thus supernaturalized our actions can claim a recompense which is in justice due to them.

"Gift" is more strictly exact in description of eternal life as the reward of the faithful service of God than "wage," for as St. Thomas says: "Our works, if they are considered in their nature, and as they come from man's free will, do not condignly (i.e. as having equal worth) merit eternal life, but only in so far as they proceed from the grace of the Holy Spirit." Thus, ultimately man's meritorious works are so only in virtue of sanctifying grace which is a free and gratuitous gift of God.

This life eternal, which God so generously bestows upon all who fight valiantly as good soldiers in His army of Justice, is "in Christ Jesus our Lord," i.e., as St. Thomas explains, "through Christ, or inasmuch as we are in Him through faith and charity."

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

St. Mary's Seminary
Perryville, Missouri

OBSCURITIES IN THE LATIN PSALTER

XIII

79. Ps. 74:3a. (Thursday, at None.)

Cum accepero tempus, ego justitias judicabo.

This is literal enough in accord with all our sources, but two circumstances may make its meaning clearer. First, the Hebrew of *tempus* is radically "appointment" or time agreed upon, yielding the derived meanings "meeting," "season," and "feast." Its more general meaning is in evidence here. Secondly, the reader is unprepared for a tacit change of the source of utterance. As God Himself appears to speak in vv. 4-6, it is further likely that His unannounced address begins here in 3. His chastisement of human arrogance may be deferred, but it will come at His own "appointed time," in common with all His other "marvels" acknowledged in the preceding verse. It is further probable (though not essential) that the Hebrew original of *cum* has here, as often, a concessive force more particular than mere "when." Thus, with LXX and V, we may follow TM in reading,

Though I take an appointed time,
I will judge rightly.

80. Ps. 74:7. (Thursday, at None.)

Quia neque ab oriente, neque ab occidente, neque a desertis montibus.

Where is the affirmation? In TM the first member of the couplet includes two points of the compass, while the second, mentioning only "the desert of mountains," prolongs itself a little for rhythm's sake by repeating the initial negative, omitted before "the West." Jerome (with this merely connective exception) exactly reproduces TM when he writes, *Quia neque ab oriente, neque ab occidente: neque a solitudine montium.* Thus the extant and vocalized Hebrew gives us no complete sentence, nor even a subject and a predicate for which a copula might be supplied.

Most commentators would supply "shall help come," or something of the kind, to complete the sense and at the same time connect it in theme with what follows. But Hebrew could express this in a single additional word, with a further advantage to the

But what fruit had you then from those things of which you are now ashamed?[2] *For the end of these things in death.*

Here the Apostle supplies the two motives for this change of allegiance. The slavish service of Sin did yield fruit of a sort—the pleasures of sense gratification, freedom from restraint and self-discipline, but in the light of the Christian ideals the converts had learned, in view of the new and vast vistas of supernatural beauty which had been spread before their gaze as a result of their delivery from the master, Sin, and their incorporation by Baptism into Christ, they had come to regard that fruit as bitter, shameful, degrading, hollow and unsatisfying. Their time, energies and resources had been consumed in the riotous pursuit of sense pleasure, and from the experience of wanton and unrestrained indulgence they had emerged empty handed and heartsick. They had nothing to show for it all but memories of fleeting animal pleasures, which, in the light of their Christian enlightenment, had become bitter and torturing, bringing the blush of shame to their face and gnawing remorse to their souls.

But if the fruit of servitude to Sin in this life is most disappointing, the final and eternal result in the next life is appalling. It is eternal death, complete frustration, everlasting exclusion from the destiny for which man was created, union with God, the Summum Bonum.

But now set free from sin and become slaves to God, you have your fruit unto sanctification, and as your end, life everlasting.

Contrasting the fruit or advantage derived from the service of the respective masters, Sin and Justice, the Apostle now declares the fruit deriving from the service of God. St. Thomas remarks that being set free from sin and being consecrated to the service of God is "genuine freedom and the very best of service, because by Justice man is inclined to what is suited to him—and this inclination is in accord with man's nature—and is turned away from what is in line with concupiscence which is in the highest degree bestial." The good works which the service of God inspires and performs gradually sanctify the soul; build up an ever increasing store of holiness in this life, and hold out the sure hope of eternal life in the world to come.

---

[2] There is another punctuation, followed by some ancient and some modern commentators, which gives the following: "What fruit had you then in those things? Those of which you are now ashamed." This punctuation does not appreciably affect the meaning.

For the wages of Sin is death, but the gift of God is life everlasting in Christ Jesus our Lord.

In concluding this passage St. Paul reverts to the metaphor he had used before in verse 12 above, the metaphor of military service. He represents the leaders of the two opposing forces—Sin and God—after the campaign rewarding their respective soldiers. Sin pays its wage of death, eternal death, everlasting separation from God in hell. But in speaking of the reward of the faithful soldier of God St. Paul does not use the term "wages." There is something undignified, mercenary, selfish about that expression. Origen remarked long ago: "It is unworthy of God to give wages to His loyal soldiers as something due to them." Yet there is a sense in which eternal life, the reward of the faithful service of God, can be called "a just wage." God will "render to every man according to his works" (Rom. 2:6). "What a man sows that he will reap, . . . He who sows in the spirit, from the spirit he will reap life everlasting" (Gal. 6:7-8). Just as the harvest is the earned recompense of the farmer who has diligently cultivated the field, so eternal life is the recompense of the Christian who shapes his life according to the ideals of Christianity. This obviously implies merit. St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 3:8) tells them that every one "will receive his own reward according to his labor." He tells the Thessalonians (2 Thes. 1:5-7) that it is *just* for God to give those who are afflicted rest at the revelation of Jesus. To the Colossians (3:24) he writes that they will receive the inheritance as their reward. Now the terms St. Paul uses express the idea of wages for work done, and that involves merit of some kind. He also refers to this reward as *just* and as coming from the just Judge. The idea of justice entails a certain claim founded on merit with some kind of proportion between the work and the reward received for it.

But merit on our part is not absolutely merit in the sense that we of ourselves independently of God earn the reward, for there is no proportion between the works of fallen, corrupt nature and supernatural life in heaven. But the grace of God, freely and with absolutely no merit on our part granted to us, raises us to a supernatural plane, incorporates us with Christ, so that to express what is begun, and to supply "to understand" is to suppose an obscure expression for the simpler "now I perceive," or anything of the sort. Furthermore, the pronoun certainly concludes the first member of the couplet, instead of beginning the second; and in this position it is impossible to construe with "begin." Syntactically the pronoun is a subject implying a copula, so that the word rendered *coepi* by LXX and V is its predicate, and not a finite verb. We cannot agree with many of our guides (Bi., Fi., Ni., Ho.) in "I begin to understand," and the reference of "this" to the second member of the couplet. It is strained, to say the least.

Jerome discerned as much in his own Hebrew text, rendering: *Et dixi, imbecillitas mea est haec; commutatio dexterae excelsi.* This makes the second member explain *haec,* but brings us to a second root of ambiguity in *commutatio.* Its Hebrew original may be read "changing of," "repeating of" (both construct infinitives), or "the years of" (substantive in construct), all construed with *dextera.* The "hand" being the symbol of efficient power, "the right hand" signifies power exercised in conspicuous benefit.

Niglutsch, after preferring *nunc incipio* (*intellegere*) in his text, notes that "the Hebrew text can be rendered: This is my affliction, that the right hand of the Highest (His way of dealing with us) is changed." The same, following Jerome, is Zorell's preference: *Et jam dixi: dolor meus est hic, quod mutata est dextera Altissimi.* This would give us the English version

And I said, My misery is this:
the changing of the right hand of the Highest.

This in deference to excellent authority; yet not without some personal misgiving. The remaining nineteen verses of the Psalm do indeed recount God's signal benefits of the past, but not in a tone of wistful regret. Those "wonders from the beginning" (12) are reviewed in accents of praise and pious confidence, and yet with no direct petition for their continuance. The narration of them seems to be the body of the prayer itself. On this ground the writer must acknowledge his preference for another explanation, which would read the original of *coepi* as "my entreating" or "appeasing," and that of *mutatio* as "years of." All that precedes and all that follows this verse is bound in perfect harmony by translating thus:

And I said, My entreaty shall be this,
the years of the right hand of the Highest—

the former ages of His manifest providence, as the firmest ground of confidence for the future.

83. Ps. 77:69a. (Friday, at Matins.)

Et aedificavit *sicut unicornium* sanctificium suum in terra, quam fundavit in saecula.

Certainly the Hebrew word could be read, as it was by LXX, for the plural of a noun taken by all modern scholars to mean "wild ox," and already noticed in Ps. 28:6.[2] But besides the obvious difficulties of such a translation, the couplet guides us better by its comparisons. *Terra* in the second member is not actually governed by *in,* but is introduced by *sicut,* so as to pair with the original of *unicornium.* The latter Hebrew form can also mean "the heights" (as plural of a participle), and in fact sometimes denotes the heights of heaven. Loftiness and firmness are the notes ascribed to Sion's temple:

And He built up *like the heights* His sanctuary,
like the earth which He founded for ever.

84. Ps. 79:14b. (Friday, at Terce.)

Exterminavit eam aper de silva: et *singularis ferus* depastus est eam.

The Hebrew uses in the collective singular an uncommon word, apparently meaning "the moving things" or "the life" of this or that environment. It is followed by "of the field" or "of the wild"—the open country. The first word probably being obscure, LXX wrote μόνιος ἄγριος, "solitary wild (beast)," appropriated in Greek to any wild animal, but especially a boar, driven from the herd, living alone, and so much the more ferocious. This is well rendered by *singularis ferus;* but Jerome himself renders the Hebrew as *omnes bestiae agri,* which modern philology has not yet improved upon. Thus the vineyard of Israel has many despoilers:

The boar of the forest has ravaged it,
the *hosts of the field* have devoured it!

(*To be continued*)

WILLIAM H. MCCLELLAN, S.J.

Woodstock College, Maryland.

---

[2] *CBQ* Vol. I, July, 1939, p. 247.

rhythm. Besides, there is no evidence of a crisis requiring "help" at all.

We are led to accept a simple correction of Zorell, on objective grounds. First, the phrase in TM, "desert of mountains," is suspicious of itself, the well known word for "desert" rarely if ever governing any genitive except of particular locality. The identity of "the desert of mountains" remains such a mystery that Boylan even suggests "the mountains" as a source distinct from "the desert" in the original text—which is only going farther afield. Secondly, the first member of the couplet leads us to expect at least one more point of the compass in the second member, and this is satisfied by "the desert" alone, as denoting the Negeb, the arid region south of Bersabee, and thus serving as "the southland." Only the vowel-points make "desert" govern a genitive, the final word "mountains" as pointed by TM.

This word in the original was probably not *hārîm*, "mountains," but *hārûm*, "(the) loftiness" or state of eminence on which the arrogant souls of vv. 5-6 congratulate themselves. Any copyist finding the fourth letter uncertain in length would be more familiar with the first word than the second. "Eminence" as the final word of the original text would be the subject of both members, its copula being unexpressed as usual. We should then have a complete sentence, and one in perfect accord with its context:

For neither from East nor West
nor from the South (*is*) *eminence*—

but, as verse 8 goes on to say, from the divine disposal only.

81. Ps. 74:9b. (Thursday, at None.)

Et inclinavit *ex hoc in hoc:* verumtamen faex ejus *non* est exinanita.

The sense of this part of verse 9 presents three difficulties: (1) *inclinare* has its proper transitive force, but no direct object is expressed; (2) *ex hoc in hoc* is difficult; (3) the *non* of the next sentence seems contradictory. Yet the whole verse is clear in TM, where it is thus divided:

For a cup is in Yahweh's hand, and wine (that) is red;
  it is filled with a mixture; and He will pour therof.
Only its dregs will strain out, will drink
  all the ungodly ones of earth.

That is, after the pure wine with its "mixture" of condiments has been bestowed from the cup of judgment as the reward of the just, only the dregs will remain for sinners to strain out and drink.

In the last couplet the intrusive "not" is omitted by Jerome, who agrees with TM except in minor constructions: *Quia calix in manu Domini est, et vino meraco ad plenum mistus, et propinabit ab eo: verumtamen faeces ejus potabunt bibentes omnes impii terrae.* "Not" appears earliest in LXX, and is probably interpretative: the Hebrew "only" when meaning "exclusively" is placed in a sentence just as when it means "whereas" or "on the contrary" (cf. Ps. 67:7c[1]), and LXX, having given the conjunction this adversative turn, may have felt that a negation should follow. We find no other textual authority for "is *not* drained off." As for the voice of the verb, only the vocalization distinguishes the passive from the active; the latter seems correct.

Inclinavit imitates LXX in past time, but should be future (Jer. *propinabit*). Its object, the wine given as drink, lies in the partitive genitive: "He will pour out (some) of it." This clarifies *ex hoc* (i.e., *vino*). The contrary *in hoc* appears in the Syriac, in evident imitation of LXX, but is found in no other source; and the phrase as a whole warps *ex hoc* away from its natural use as complementary to the verb "will pour." It seems certain that *in hoc*, as well as *non*, should be simply dropped, leaving this portion of verse 9 to read:

> ....*He will pour thereof.*
> Only its dregs will strain out, will drink
> all the ungodly ones of earth.

82. Ps. 76:11. (Friday, at Compline.)

Et dixi: Nunc coepi: haec mutatio dexterae Excelsi.

The two key-words of the Hebrew happen to be interpretable in several ways. The adverb *nunc* has no authority; LXX probably employed it merely as appropriate to *coepi*. The latter is the first ambiguous form. As it stands, it can be translated "I have begun," or "my misery," or "my entreating" (the last two as infinitives of other verbs with a pronominal suffix). Unfortunately, *coepi* is the least probable of all. It has no complement

---

[1] *CBQ* Vol. III, April, 1941, p. 168.

ON THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD OF TEACHING SCRIPTURE

SUMMARY OF LETTER RECENTLY SENT TO THE BISHOPS OF ITALY
BY THE BIBLICAL COMMISSION IN REPLY TO A CRITICISM
MADE AGAINST THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD OF STUDY
OF SCRIPTURE AUTHORIZED BY THE CHURCH*

Rome, August 20, 1941

Your Excellency,

An anonymous writer recently sent a criticism of the method of biblical studies followed by Catholic exegetes to the Holy Father, the Cardinals, and the bishops of Italy. His objections may be grouped under four headings. The letter of the Biblical Commission answers the objections as follows:

1. ON THE LITERAL SENSE. The writer complains that Catholic exegetes in their interpretation of Scripture consider only the literal sense and take it in a purely material way. This writer himself explains the Bible according to his own fancies.

The Commission in reply reminds that it is a proposition of faith that in addition to the literal sense of Holy Writ there is also a spiritual or typical sense, as we are taught by the practice of our Lord and the Apostles. This typical sense, however, is not found in every sentence or passage. It was a grave mistake of the Alexandrian school that it tried to discover a symbolical sense everywhere, even at the sacrifice of the literal or historical sense. The spiritual or typical sense must be based on the literal and must be established by the usage of Christ, of the Apostles or inspired writers, or by the traditional use of the Holy Fathers and of the Church, especially as found in the sacred liturgy, since "lex orandi est lex credendi." While accomodations may be used in sermons and ascetical works for edification, these are not to be advanced as real senses of Scripture, unless supported as just described.

It is a rule stated by St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa,* I. q. 1. a. 10. ad i) and prescribed by the *Providentissimus Deus* of Leo XIII and the *Spiritus Paraclitus* of Benedict XV that all senses of Scripture are founded on the literal sense, and that from this latter by itself alone argument can be drawn. Thus Leo XIII says that the exegete shall weigh well the meaning of the words, the context, parallel passages, and external aids; and that he must never depart from the literal, and as it were obvious sense, without good reason or necessity. Benedict XV said that the very wording of Scripture must be most carefully considered in order to know for certain what the sacred writer has said. In this he cites as a model St. Jerome, who, when he had first established the literal or historical meaning, proceeded to draw out the inner and higher meaning. The Pontiff then recommended to exegetes that they follow this example of rising moderately and temperately from the literal to the higher senses of Scripture. Both Leo XIII and Benedict XV quote St. Jerome's saying that a commentator should seek to expound not what he himself wishes, but what the author means to say.

---

* This statement was recently received by the Very Rev. C. J. Callan, O.P., American Consultor of the Biblical Commission, from the Most Rev. Secretary of the Commission with instructions to give it wide publicity. The importance of the paper is obvious. The summary and translation is from the pen of Fathers Callan and McHugh.

2. ON THE USE OF THE VULGATE. Even more palpable is the error of this anonymous booklet on the meaning of Trent concerning the use of the Vulgate. The Council, in order to remedy the confusion caused by the new Latin and vernacular translations of its time, wished that for public use in the Western Church the common Latin version, employed for centuries by the Church herself, should be sanctioned. It had no thought of lessening in the least the authority of the ancient versions used in the Oriental Churches, especially of the Septuagint, used by the Apostles themselves, and much less the authority of the original texts. The Council resisted a group among the Fathers who wanted to have the Vulgate proclaimed the only authoritative text, to the exclusion of the use of all others.

The anonymous writer thinks that in virtue of the decree of Trent we have in the Latin Vulgate a text that has been declared superior to all others, and so he censures the exegetes for wishing to interpret the Vulgate with the help of the originals and other ancient versions. For him the decree gives us such certainty about the sacred text that the Church has no need to search further for the authentic word of God, and this not merely in matters of faith and morals, but in all respects, even literary, geographical, chronological, and the like. He holds that the decree of Trent has given us the authentic and official text, from which one may not depart; and that consequently all textual criticism is a mutilation of Scripture and a usurpation of the authority of the Church.

To this the Commission replies that such views are first against common sense, which will never agree that any version can be superior to the original text. They are, furthermore, against the mind of the Fathers of Trent themselves, as appears from the Acts of the Council. The Council was well aware of the need for a revision and correction of the Vulgate itself, and left the supervision of this work to the Supreme Pontiffs. This wish of the Council the Popes proceeded to accomplish, and further (under Sixtus V) a corrected edition of the LXX was made. Commissions were also set up for like editions of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament. Again, the views of the anonymous writer are openly opposed to the Encyclical *Providen-*

tissimus which commanded that account be taken of the other versions which Christian antiquity has esteemed and used, and in particular of the original languages.

In short, the Council of Trent declared the Vulgate "authentic" in the juridical sense, that is, as regards its proving force in matters of faith and morals. But in so doing it did not ignore the possibility of divergencies between it and the original texts and the ancient versions, as every good work of Introduction explains from the Acts of the Council.

3. ON TEXTUAL CRITICISM. Holding, as does the anonymous writer, the value of the Vulgate to be almost unique, it is not surprising that he regards textual criticism as unnecessary and useless. The recent discoveries of very precious texts, however, prove the opposite of his contention. He states that the Church has presented the Vulgate to us as the official text and guaranteed it, and that therefore textual criticism, or attempts to establish a text, treats a sacred book as human, and mutilates the Bible. This whole procedure, he says, amounts to naturalism and modernism. The original texts and ancient versions, he claims, may be used only for consultation in difficulties; the Greek text may not be preferred to the other texts, and especially to the official Vulgate; nor may entire passages or versions be expunged from the Vulgate or from the original.

In answer to all this the Commission says:

Catholic biblical science, from the days of Origen and St. Jerome down to the establishment of the "Commission for the revision and emendation of the Vulgate" instituted by the Pope of the *Pascendi,* has labored to establish the purest possible form of the original text and of the versions, especially of the Vulgate. Leo XIII in his Apostolic Letter *Vigilantiae* earnestly desired that our scholars should cultivate the critical art as most useful for discovering thoroughly the meaning of the sacred writers; and he expressed his willingness that they should, when necessary, consult the works of outsiders. The Biblical Commission also in its decree of June 27, 1906, laid down concerning the Pentateuch (and the same rule, due requirements being observed, can be said of other books of the Bible; see decree on Psalms) that one may admit that certain modifications were made in it during the course of centuries, such as: additions made after the death of Moses, or by an inspired writer, or glosses and explanations interjected into the text; certain words and forms translated from older to later speech; defective readings due to the fault of copyists, about which it is permitted to inquire and judge according to critical standards. Moreover, the Holy Office has permitted, and still permits, that Catholic exegetes may discuss the question of the *Comma Joanneum,* and, having weighed the arguments on both sides with the moderation which the gravity of the matter demands, may pronounce against the genuinity of the text.

All this is overlooked by the booklet in question, so opposed is it to the work of Catholic exegetes, who, faithful to Catholic traditions and the norms of the supreme Church authority, prove by their painful labors of textual criticism how great is their respect for the Sacred Text.

4. ON THE STUDY OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES AND AUXILIARY SCIENCES. One is moved to pity and even indignation at the levity and incredible arrogance of the anonymous writer when he speaks of Hebrew, Syriac, and Aramaic as if they were matter for scientfic pride, and vain display of erudition. Orientalism, he thinks, has degenerated into a fetich, and Oriental scholarship today is often very questionable.

Such scorn, the Commission says, is calculated not only to discourage these hard studies, but to promote lightness and levity in the treatment of the sacred books, and so tends inevitably to lessen the supreme respect and submissiveness which is owed to them and the fear of using them in any unsuitable manner. Such a spirit is quite opposite to that of the Church, which from St. Jerome's day to our own has favored Oriental studies, knowing that "it is necessary for Scripture professors to be acquainted with the languages in which the canonical books were written by the sacred writers" (*Providentissimus Deus*). Leo XIII in the same Encyclical recommended for higher schools of learning that chairs of ancient languages, especially Semitic, and of cognate disciplines, be set up; and he exhorted in his Apostolic Letter *Vigilantiae* that knowledge of Oriental languages should not be less valued among Catholics than among non-Catholics. The study of the biblical tongues, Hebrew and Greek, recommended by Leo XIII for theological institutes of learning, was made obligatory for them by Pius X, and this law is recalled in the Constitution *Deus Scientiarum Dominus.*

Naturally the study of the Oriental languages and auxiliary sciences is not for the exegete an end in itself. It is a means for understanding and expounding precisely and clearly the divine word in order that it may provide all possible nourishment for the spiritual life. It is not, then, a spirit of narrow pedantry or an ill concealed distrust of the spiritual understanding that moves us to recommend and inculcate the search for the literal meanings with all the aids of philology and criticism. On the contrary, we should disapprove all excessive, exclusive, and abusive employment of that sense, such as would treat the Bible as if it were not a divine work. But "*abusus non tollit usum,*" and so it is not permitted to throw suspicion on the right use of exegetical principles.

The anonymous writer seeks to support his ideas by the authority of the Encyclical *Pascendi,* but without success. As Leo XIII in the *Providentissimus Deus* gave the Magna Charta for biblical studies, calling this most important subject to the attention of the whole Church, so Pius X, on his own personal initiative, gave the definite direction to this teaching, especially in Rome and Italy. In his experience as Bishop he had observed at close hand the imperfections in biblical teaching and its disastrous results. Soon after his election as pope he instituted (Feb. 23, 1904) the degrees of licentiate and doctorate in Scripture, knowing that this would be an efficacious means of calling students to specialize in the Bible. Lacking the means to establish the Institute of Higher Biblical Studies which he had in mind, Pius X, nevertheless, in 1906, encouraged the teaching of Scripture in the Roman Pontifical seminary. Then in 1908 and 1909 he ordered a higher course of Sacred Scripture to be given in the Gregorianum and the Angelico. Then in 1909 he created the Pontifical Biblical Institute, which has done so much to promote progress in scriptural studies, especially in Italy, as the large number of Italian students in the Institute and the annual Biblical Week give proof. Finally, it was Pius X who settled the rules for the teaching of Scripture in seminaries (Mch. 27, 1906), and provided for their application in the seminaries of Italy (May 10, 1907).

Whatever be the aims of the anonymous writer, biblical studies must go on in the seminaries of Italy according to the directions of recent Supreme Pontiffs. Today, no less than yesterday, priests and ministers of the Word must be well prepared and able to give a satisfactory answer not only to questions of dogma and moral, but also to difficulties against the historical truth and religious doctrines of the Bible, and specially of the Old Testament.

We shall conclude with the closing exhortation of the *Spiritus Paraclitus* urging the clergy to be filled with the spirit of that holy exegete, St. Jerome, and to make themselves worthy of their office by knowledge, since biblical study must not be neglected nor conducted other than in the manner prescribed by the *Providentissimus Deus* of Leo XIII.

The Holy Father himself in an audience with the Most Rev. Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission on August 16, 1941, deigned to approve the deliberations of the Eminent members of the Commission in the present matter and to order that the present letter be sent out.

In fulfilling the charge confided to me, I beg you, Most Rev. Bishop, to accept my homage, while I sign myself

Your Most Reverend Paternity's
devoted servant,
(Signed) Eug. Cardinal Tisserant, President
(Signed) J. M. Vosté, O.P., Secretary

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CORNER

BETHEL (Beitin)

The Arab village of Beitin, located on an elevation about eleven miles north of Jerusalem and a little more than a mile east of the present Jerusalem-Nablus road, is generally considered to be the site of the ancient Canaanite city of Luz, which in biblical times came to be known as Bethel (House of God). It was in this vicinity that Jacob, while on a journey to Haran, was favored with a theophany, and it is to this experience that the patriarchal narratives trace the name of Bethel (Gen. 28:11-22; 31:13; 35:1,6-7,15).

While asleep here in the open, with a stone for a pillow, Jacob beheld in vision an immense ladder reaching from earth to heaven. Angels were ascending and descending upon it. Presently, God himself appeared to Jacob and renewed the promises previously made to his father Isaac and to his grandfather Abraham. The land wherein he was now sleeping would belong to him and to his seed. As the dust of the earth would that seed be in number. In him and in his seed would all the tribes of the earth be blessed.

Jacob awoke trembling, and exclaimed: "Indeed the Lord is in this place! This is no other but the house of God (Beth Elohim) and the gate of heaven." Taking the stone upon which he had rested his head, he set it up as a religious memorial (*maṣṣebah*), pouring oil upon it and vowing that should he return safely, this stone would be for him a shrine (Beth Elohim). The name of this place he called Bethel, and ultimately the name became attached to the nearby city of Luz ("Oulamlouz" of the Septuagint is a mistake for "ulam Luz" of the Hebrew). When Jacob returned to the spot twenty years later, he built there an altar, and called the place El-Bethel. Two generations earlier, his grandfather Abraham had also built an altar somewhere in the same neighborhood, by a "mountain on the east side of Bethel . . . having Bethel on the west and Hai on the east" (Gen. 12:8; 13:3-4), but the name of Bethel here is probably used proleptically, unless perchance the Canaanites had a sanctuary or "bethel" of their own in the region. Debbora, who had been Rebecca's nurse, died in the vicinity, and Jacob buried her "at the foot of Bethel under an oak, and the name of that place was called the Oak of Weeping" (Gen. 35:8).

Bethel is next referred to in conection with the capture of Hai (Jos. 7:2; 8:9,12,17; 12:9). After the destruction of Jericho, Josue sent men to reconnoiter Hai, which is described as being "beside Bethaven, on the east side of the town of Bethel" (Sept. has only "beside Bethel"). The initial attack was a failure, but Hai was finally taken by stratagem, an ambush having been laid "between Bethel and Hai, on the west side of the city of Hai." Nothing is said, however, of any attack on Bethel at this time. True, a king of Bethel (omitted in

Sept.) is mentioned in the list of kings slain by Josue (Jos. 12:16), but judging from the position in the list, this may be another Bethel or Bethul further to the south (Jos. 19:4; 1 Par. 4:30; 1 Kgs. 30:27). In the distribution of territory among the tribes, Bethel was assigned to Benjamin (Jos. 18:12). It was situated on the boundary line between Benjamin and Ephraim (Jos. 16:1-2; 18:13), but it was the tribe of Ephraim which finally subdued it (Jos. 1:22-26; 1 Par. 7:28).

During the period of the Judges, the Lord "was consulted" at times in Bethel, and the Ark of the Covenant seems to have been there temporarily (Jdgs. 20:18,26-27; 21:2). Silo, however, was the usual resting place of the Ark until its capture by the Philistines. It must be noted here that the Vulgate in place of "Bethel" at Jdgs. 20:18 and 21:2 has "domum Dei in Silo." In the earlier part of this period, the prophetess Debbora "sat under a palm tree, which was called by her name, between Rama and Bethel in mount Ephraim: and the children of Israel came up to her for all judgment" (Jdgs. 4:5). Samuel, the last of the Judges, judged not only in Ramatha, his dwelling place, but also in Bethel, Galgal and Masphath (1 Kgs. 7:16-17). When Samuel had anointed Saul secretly as the first king of the Israelites, he instructed him to go to the Oak of Thabor (Debbora?) where he would meet three men going up to God to Bethel (1 Kgs. 10:3).

Following the death of Solomon, the Hebrew kingdom was divided into the northern Kingdom of Israel and the southern Kingdom of Juda. Jeroboam of Israel, hoping to keep his people from going to Jerusalem for religious purposes, set up golden calves in Bethel and Dan, saying: "Go ye up no more to Jerusalem: Behold thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt" (3 Kgs. 12:28-33). He devised a ritual in imitation of that at Jerusalem, but with a non-Levitical priesthood in charge. He himself "went up to the altar, which he had built in Bethel . . . to burn incense." The new cult had hardly been established when an unnamed prophet came up from Juda, denouncing it and prophesying its downfall (3 Kgs. 13:1 ff). Bethel was taken from Jeroboam by Abia of Juda (2 Par. 13:19), but apparently was soon recovered by Baasa of Israel (3 Kgs. 15:17; 2 Par. 16:1). During the reign of Achab of Israel, Hiel of Bethel attempted to rebuild Jericho, which had lain in ruins since its destruction by Josue (3 Kgs. 16:34). There was a school of prophets at Bethel with whom the great prophet Elias was on friendly terms (4 Kgs. 2:2-3). A group of boys from Bethel mocked the prophet Eliseus as he was going up to that city from Jericho. "Go up, thou bald head," they called after him, and Eliseus turning cursed them in the name of the Lord. Two bears came out of the forest and mangled forty-two of the boys (4 Kgs. 2:23-24).

Although Jehu destroyed Baal worship in the northern kingdom, he allowed the cult of the golden Calves to remain (4 Kgs. 10:29), and under his great grandson Jeroboam II, Bethel was considered a royal sanctuary (Am. 7:13). It was during the reign of Jeroboam II that the prophets Amos and Osee rose up to denounce in scathing terms this sanctuary and the superstitious worship carried on there (Am. 3:14); 4:4; 5:5-6; 7:10,13; Os. 10:15; 12:4). After the destruction of the northern kingdom, one of the captive priests was sent back by the King of Assyria to teach the people who had been colonized there the worship of the "god of the land," and he took up his dwelling at Bethel (4 Kgs. 17:27-28). Ultimately, Bethel came under the control of Juda, and Josias in his great religious reformation destroyed the sanctuary at Bethel (4 Kgs. 23:4,15-20). Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonians in 586 B.C., and very probably Bethel also. In his prophecy against Moab, Jeremias states that "Moab shall be ashamed of Chamos, as the house of Israel was ashamed of Bethel, in which they trusted" (Jer. 48:13). Men of Bethel and Hai were among those who returned with Zorobabel in 536 B.C. from the Babylonian captivity, and they dwelt again in these cities (Esd. 2:28; Neh. 7:32; 11:31). During the wars of the Machabees, the Syrian general Bacchides fortified Bethel and several other cities in the vicinity "with walls and gates and bars" (1 Mach. 9:49-50). Bethel is not mentioned in the New Testament. Josephus says that it was captured by Vespasian, who left a garrison there and in Ephraim (Jew. Wars IV. 9,9).

In 1927, soundings were made at Beitin by Prof. W. F. Albright. The American Schools of Oriental Research and the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary sponsored an excavation there in the summer of 1934 under the direction of Prof. Albright and of Prof. J. L. Kelso.[1] As an Arab village occupies a considerable portion of the site, it was not possible to excavate more than a few small areas in a fig orchard to the north of the village. The results, while not spectacular, were interesting and important. Keen disappointment, nevertheless, was felt that no traces of Jeroboam's sanctuary were found and that the constructions of Iron Age II, which would include the golden age of this sanctuary, were so inferior to those at other sites.

Bed rock was reached in about one fourth of the area excavated. According to the pottery indications, occupation of the site could be traced to the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age in the 21st century B.C. During the Late Bronze Age (1500-1200 B.C.), a typical well-built Canaanite city flourished there, which came to an end by a destructive conflagration some time in the 13th century B.C., according to Prof. Albright. Most probably the destruction of Canaanite Bethel was due to the Israelite invaders. The cultural remains of the Iron Age city built upon its ashes, indicate a distinctly different civilization. The Iron Age Bethel came to an end also by a conflagration, which may have been the work of the Babylonian invaders at the beginning of the sixth century B.C. Nothing has been said by the excavators regarding any remains from the Persian perod. From the Hellenistic-Roman period there was found a good assortment of coins dating from the fourth century B.C. to the first century B.C. Although the general sequence of cultures is clear, another season of digging would be useful in filling the gaps.

---

[1] *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* No. 56, pp. 2 ff and No. 57, pp. 2-15.

About two miles from Beitin is et-Tell, generally identified as Hai. Mme. Krause-Marquet excavated there during 1933 and 1934, and found an Early Bronze Age city which had been destroyed in the 22nd century B.C., or before Bethel was built, and remained in ruins during the whole time that the Canaanite Bethel (Luz) flourished.[2] The word Hai does mean "The Ruin." An apparent difficulty is raised against its capture by Josue, and no end of theorizing has resulted. Fr. Vincent suggests that Hai may have been occupied as an outpost for Bethel. As Iron Age Bethel proved a disappointment, W. Ross has revived Conder's theory that Jeroboam's Bethel is to be sought at Shechem.[3] Evidently archaeology raises a few problems occasionally.

EDWARD CERNY, S.S.

St. Mary's Seminary
Baltimore, Md.

---

[2] See Fr. Vincent's review in *Revue Biblique*, 1937, pp. 231-266.

[3] "Is Beitin the Bethel of Jeroboam?" in *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 1941, pp. 22-27.

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

Prophetical and Didactic Literature of the Old Testament

American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 58, 1941. Herbert Gordon May, "'*Al* . . . in the Superscriptions of the Psalms" (70-83). The *'al* introduces the name of a melody. The tune-names given "may have been as much a mystery to the Hebrews of the post-exilic period as they are to us" (this the author says twice). On the presumption that the origin of things Hebrew in religion and music is to be found in things Canaanite, the investigation takes a mythological turn, and accounts for several superscriptions as carrying mythological allusions; in all, anywhere from nine to fourteen psalm-titles present us with obscure names of as many different melodies.

J. Philip Hyatt, "A Note on Yiwwāda' in Ps. 74:5" (99-100). Building on a suggestion of D. Winton Thomas in *J.T.S.*, Hyatt proposes the meaning of "smitten" (passive from "be quiet, be submissive") for the word cited.

Biblica, 22, 1941. A. Pohl, "Jeremias 9:20" (36-37). Adduces a text from Ras Shamra (tablet II AB) to throw light on the expression "Death has climbed in through our windows."

I. Zolli, "Il Salmo 51:6" (198-200). The *Kaph* of לבדך is an erroneous repetition of the *kaph* of לך. He translates the phrase, "*Di fronte a Te—ho soltanto peccato* (*anziche; di fronte a Te soltanto ho peccato*)." Sin is all the psalmist has done before God.

A. Vaccari, reviewing R. Devreesse's "*Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes* (*I-LXXX*)" (205-213). The use of Theodore's commentary, here reconstructed in large part for the first time, restores a few primitive LXX readings otherwise lost, and supplies some material for Α, Σ and Θ, besides whatever exegetical value it may have. A publication of the commentary on the Psalms of Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore's master, is promised for the near future. Vaccari has a similar review of the same publication in *Civiltà Cattolica,* Anno 92, 1941, II, 210-16.

Expository Times, 51, 1939-40. E. E. Kellett, "Job: an Allegory?" (250-51). Job represents Israel in prosperity, suffering and final triumph.

W. H. A. Learoyd, "The Envy of the Devil in Wisdom, 2:24" (395-6). *Διαβόλου* refers to Cain, *i.e.,* Abel's adversary; hence the meaning would be, "By the envy of an adversary (Cain) death came into the world."

Ibid., 52, 1940-41. N. H. Snaith, "The Interpretation of El Gibbor in Isaiah IX, 5" (36-37). Suggests reading the verse,

"And the mighty God hath called his name Wonder, Counsellor,
The everlasting Father (hath called his name) Prince of Peace."

E. C. Blackman, "The Relevance of the Old Testament Prophets: Isaiah" (64-67). An attempt to bring out a parallel between the warring countries of Isaias' time and those of today.

J. S. MacArthur, "The Pre-exilic Prophets and Pacifism" (97-100). Most of the prophets were against war as an instrument of national policy without condemning war outright.

Christopher R. North, "Who was the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah LIII?" (181-84; 219-21). The author presents several views as to who the servant was. He accepts and argues for the messianic interpretation.

Herbert Loewe, "Zechariah XIV, 5" (277-9). Mentions two pieces of information concerning this verse from the *Seder 'ôlām,* the earliest Hebrew post-biblical chronicle:—that *ve-nistam* is to be read, and that Zach. XIV is a separate entity, the work of a contemporary of Isaias.

Norman H. Snaith, "The Exegesis of Isaiah XL, 5,6" (394-6). Holds that the correct rendering of v. 5 is,

"And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed,
And all flesh shall see together that the mouth of the Lord has spoken."

In verse 6, חסד means "reliability," "steadfastness."

Harvard Theological Review, 34, 1941. Campbell Bonner, "Desired Haven" (49-67). A collection of ancient Greek and patristic texts involving the comparison of human life, or of the Church, to a ship. The article takes its title from Ps. 107:30, but biblical material is otherwise left out of account.

Jewish Quarterly Review, 32, 1941-2. Samuel Krauss, "The Archaeological Background of Some Passages in the Song of Songs" (115-37). This title forms a curious introduction to a series of conjectures which do little to advance the understanding or the exegesis of Canticles. Some pages are devoted to preparing us for the rendering of 1:10 as "Thy cheeks are comely with rows [of flesh], thy neck with ringlets [of skin]." The bride's neck is "built in terraces" (4:4). 6:4 is also discussed at length; the study is to be continued.

Journal of Theological Studies, 42, 1941. Eric Burrows, S.J., "Notes on the Pearl in Biblical Literature" (53-64). A very detailed study, provoked by the manifest divergence of renderings for *pᵉnînîm,* with many moderns inclining to "corals." The two main sections are:—I. Peninim in Text and Versions; II. The Word פנינים. The conclusion drawn is that although the term may properly denote pearls, it may at the same time have the signification, "jewels, gems," generically.

E. R. Rowlands, "Inner-Syriac Corruptions in the Book of Psalms," (65-67). A text-critical study of the Peshitta psalter.

Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift, 93, 1940. Heinrich Kaupel, "Venite, mittamus lignum in panem ejus. Jer. 11, 19" (145-7). Takes note of the Vulgate relationship here to the LXX and later Jewish tradition, as against the Masoretic text. Concludes that a desire to stress the messianic character of the passage has led to acceptance in the Latin of a forced and erroneous translation.

Karl Fruhstorfer, "Ezechiels Anfangsvisionen (Ez. 1–3)" (185-98). An exegetical study, section by section; holds for a faithful description by Ezechiel of exactly what he saw, with no dependence for details on any Akkadian source.

Ibid., 94, 1941. Karl Fruhstorfer, "Des Weisen curriculum vitae nach Sirach (39:1-15)" (140-42). The training, piety, divine vocation to teach, and blessed memory of the Old Testament sage described from Ecclus. 39:1-15, with an application to the Doctors of the Church, for whose Common in the Breviary this selection forms the first nocturn lessons.

Heinrich Kaupel, "Alttestamentliche Motive in den Karfreitags-Improperien" (150-54). Relationship of the Good Friday Improperia to the Psalms and the Prophets for their moving portrayal of God's salvific plan.

Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 57, (NF 16), 1939, Heft 3-4 (published Aug. 5, 1940). Johannes Fichtner, "Der AT-Text der Sapientia Salomonis" (155-92). The author sets for himself the problem, what text of the O.T. books was known to the author of Wisdom? He finds no large bulk of O.T. material underlying chapters 1–5. He examines the parallels between Wisdom and the creation and patriarchal narratives, the plague descriptions and the Solomon account, as well as other evident points of contact in the historical books. Wisdom's favorite sources, whose Greek terminology he borrows, according to Fichtner, are the books of Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes and certain Psalms; Isaias, especially chapters 40–66; and the historical portions just noted. Striking resemblances are also discovered to the text of Symmachus, insofar as that is known to us.

Fichtner's conclusion, after a setting-forth of the parallels in the order of their occurrence in Wisdom, is: Wisdom never goes with MT versus LXX and the other Greek renderings; it often goes with LXX or a Greek rendering versus MT. This is true from one end of Wisdom to the other. Many turns of expression in Wisdom prove a clear knowledge of O.T. passages in the Greek dress in which they have come down to us. Fichtner admits an influence of Isa. 40 ff. on Wisdom which is greater than that of any other O.T. book; he does not remark the pre-eminence of that influence in the first five chapters (cf. above). The prophets, apart from Isaias, play an astonishingly small part. He again admits an influence of Eccles. and Tobias on Wis.; Ecclus. is given with a query. He sees in the kinship with the Symmachus fragments and in other departures from the LXX renderings evidence of a complicated recensional history for the Greek O.T., of which what remains to us is only a partial manifestation.

Alfred Jepsen, "Kleine Beiträge zum Zwölfprophetenbuch, II" (242-55). Examines the structure of 'deutero-Zacharias' (Zach. 9-14). Finds three strata; the first composed of four old pieces (9:1-7; 9: 9-10; 10:1-2; 11:4-14, with slight omissions in the first and last); the second, a unified composition including these and extending through chapter 13; the third, some expansions in chapters 9, 10 and 12, with all of chapter 14. The first of the four old pieces would be from the Israel of Jeroboam II, c. 750-700 B.C. The unitary composition would have two main parts, 9:1–11:3 and 11:4–13:9. Of these, the former is said to deal with the gathering of the people of Israel from the world empires into God's kingdom under a governing Messias; the latter, with the rejection of the Messias by his people, their delivery to false shepherds and subsequent rescue and purification. The expansions are passages in which God is spoken of in the third person. The whole is to be dated from the end of the fifth to the beginning of the third century B.C., with the expansions likely to date nearer the end of that span.

K. Ellinger, "Chammanim=Masseben?" (255-65). Apropos of J. Lindblom's *Die Jesaia-Apokalypse*, Ellinger takes issue with the chapter devoted to the term *chammānīm*. Linblom had distinguished between texts (Isa., Lev., Ez.) in which sun-pillars were meant, and others (2 Par.) with a meaning of pillars dedicated to the god Chammōn; in late inscriptions, altars of incense were indicated by the term. This latter meaning Ellinger insists upon as the only one which fits the parallelism and context of the biblical passages, as well as the inscriptional evidence and the anepigraphic finds of archaeology. An etymological dependence on (*Baal*) *hamon* is unlikely; the root *ḥmm*, "be hot," supplies an adequate explanation.

J. J. Stamm, "Eine Erwägung zu Hos. 6:1-2" (266-8). Arguing from the language of verse 1, Stamm maintains that Osee 6:2 refers not to death and resurrection, but to sickness and restored health.

I. Zolli, "Hosea 6:5" (p. 288). For הרגתים read רגמתים. The conjectural reading would be related in sense to רעם and Akkadian *ragāmu*; the rendering would be, "I have thundered at them with the word of my mouth" and Jer. 23:28 would be a related passage.

Among the notices in *Theologische Revue,* 39, 1940, a number of valuable exegetical and text-critical studies are described, most of which will probably not be available in America for some time. J. Ziegler reviews Joh. Fischer's "*Das Buch Isaias, II. Teil* (Bonner Bibel)" and J. Begrich's "*Studien zu Deuterojesaja*" in columns 51-55. The same reviewer examines F. Wutz' "*Das Buch Job*" and H. Bückers' "*Die Makkabäerbücher; Das Buch Job* (Herders Bibelkommentar)" (coll. 8-10), as well as W. Grossouw's "*The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets*" (coll. 105-6) and A. Dold's "*Neue St. Galler vorhieronymische Propheten-Fragmenten*" (coll. 205-6). Of the Tübingen Handbuch zum Alten Testament, J. Goettsberger gives a careful notice of A. Bentzen's "*Daniel*" (coll. 10-13), and Paul Heinisch an apprecia-of Joh. Fichtner's "*Weisheit Salomos*" (coll. 13-14).

PATRICK W. SKEHAN
JOHN P. WEISSENGOFF

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

BIBLICAL NEWS

The Catholic Biblical Association of America held its Fifth General Meeting at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia, Pa., November 15-16, 1941. One of the highlights of the meeting was the Right Reverend Monsignor William L. Newton's report on the Confraternity Edition of the revised New Testament which was published May 18, 1941. So far, editorial comment on the New Translation has been limited. *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review* for October and December carried articles on several passages. *The Ecclesiastical Review* for December published a letter from a reader critical of several phases of the New Revision. The "Book Fair," Supplement of The Philadelphia Record (October 5) carried an article in praise of the Revised New Testament. The *Revista Biblica* (September), published under the direction of Monsignor Dr. J. Straubinger, at La Plata, Argentina, also expressed itself very favorably on the new text. Apart from these public pronouncements, the Editorial Board for the New Testament received a few letters expressing critical views on the new text. Readers of the new translation, and in particular, members of the Catholic Biblical Association are urged to submit their comments to the Committee established for the purpose of improving the text.

In attendance and in achievement the Fifth General Meeting ranks among the best of the Association. Seventy members were present. Definite plans were made for publishing the one-volume commentary on the New Testament during the coming year. Work on the revision of the Old Testament was better coordinated to insure greater accuracy and speed. The Meeting authorized the preparation and publication of a series of scientific commentaries on all the books of the Bible and appointed a committee to organize the project. The first part of a library of visual aids in the teaching of Scripture was put at the disposal of the members of the Association.

The following officers were elected for the current year: President, Very Rev. Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M.; Vice-President, Rev. John F. Rowan; General Secretary, Rev. Edward H. Donzé, S.M.; Recording Secretary, Rev. John J. Dougherty; Treasurer, Rev. John E. Steinmueller.

The Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine has appointed the Rev. Edward P. Arbez, S.S., and the Right Rev. William L. Newton Consultors of the Association.

Some of the papers read at the meeting are found in this issue of the Quarterly. The complete report of the meeting will be given in the next issue.

The General Secretary reports that over 450,000 copies of the Confraternity Edition of the Revised New Testament have been sold, and that it was expected that before the end of the year the half million mark would be reached.

Under the able direction of the Rev. John F. Rowan, S.T.D., S.S.L., St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa., a fine biblical exhibit was arranged at the General Meeting. Besides the regular edition of the revised New Testament, several more expensive editions were displayed. These can be secured from St. Anthony's Guild Press, Paterson, N. J.

According to reports, the Revised New Testament has been received favorably in England. The Very Reverend Monsignor J. M. T. Barton, D.D., S.S.L. writes that many of the clergy are using the new text. The Very Reverend Monsignor served as a member of the Editorial Board for the Revision of the New Testament, and has long been a Consultor of the Pontifical Biblical Commission.

The National New Testament Committee, which had been appointed for the distribution of the Revised New Testament, was formally dissolved November 1, 1941. After several months of intense work the committee finely caught up with the heavy demand for copies of the new text. Copies may now be procured without delay from St. Anthony's Guild Press, from any Catholic Book Store, or from the newly established office of CONFRATERNITY PUBLICATIONS, 144 West 32nd Street, New York City, New York.

The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine has opened an auxiliary publications office in New York for the wider distribution of the revised New Testament and the revised Baltimore Catechism. Leon Dohn, who had been active in the organizing work of the Holy Name Society, is in charge of the office. The office recently announced the release of *The Life of Christ,* Part I, of the New Testament Series. An illustrated outline, it is based on the confraterity edition of the Revised New Testament . The work is under the direction of the Right Rev. William L. Newton, secretary of the editorial board of the Catholic Biblical Association of America, and the Rev. Gregory Smith of Denver, Colorado, national chairman of the Confraternity of Christion Doctrine discussion clubs, and other scholars and leaders in discussion club procedure.

The Massachusetts Bible Society, a non-Catholic organization, according to reports received, has purchased copies of the Revised New Testament, and distributed them among Catholic families.

W. H. Sadlier, Inc., of New York, publishers of *The Epistles and Gospels For Sundays and Holydays* reports that the first edition of fifteen thousand copies has been exhausted. The publishers have prepared a second edition to meet the heavy demands for the book.

A specially bound volume of the revised text of *The Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holydays* was presented to the Most Reverend Giovanni Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, for his Holiness Pope Pius XII. The presentation was made by the Rev. Edward H. Donzé, S.M., general secretary of the Catholic Biblical Association of America.

In accordance with the policy adopted by the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, the use and printing of the revised text of the New Testament will be subject to the authority of the committee for some time. However, any author or publisher with proper permission is allowed to print the text in whole or in part as long as the material published might be considered a distinct literary contribution. Already, several publishers have made use of the privilege: C. Wilderman Co., Inc. of New York has published a prayer book entitled *Gems of Prayer.* The manual of prayers and devotional exercises contains the new text of the Epistles and Gospels for all Sundays and Holydays of obligation.

The Confraternity of the Precious Blood under the direction of the Reverend Joseph T. Stedman of Brooklyn, N. Y., has published *My Daily Reading from the New Testament* and *My Daily Readings from the Four Gospels."* The pocket-size, day-by-day New Testament was arranged by Father Stedman and uses the authorized new text. The foreword contains brief introductions to the Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Apocalypse. The same Confraternity has published *My Sunday Missal,* and *My Sunday Missal and Manual.* Both contain the Epistles and Gospels of the revised text.

Georgetown University of Washington, D. C., and Loyola College of Baltimore, Maryland, have organized a four-year undergraduate course in biblical studies, making abundant use of the Revised New Testament.

The freshman year will include the reading of the Gospels four times in the first semester, with a frankly Catholic rather than an apologetic approach. The second semester will seek to order into a consecutive account the facts of the Gospels. The study in the second year will include the fundamental and steady orientation of our Lord's life toward the Cross and through the Cross toward the Resurrection. The Acts of the Apostles and the study of the Holy Spirit as the indwelling Agent in the supernatural life of the individual members of the Church will be the basis for the work of the junior year. The apologetic approach to the New Testament will be undertaken in the fourth year, when the students will pass judgment on Protestant and rationalistic "answers" to it and will formulate and defend scientifically the Catholic answer.

C. Wildermann Co., Inc., New York, sole distributors for the Douay Bible House have published a new edition of the Douay Bible. The preface for the new edition was written by the Reverend William H. McClellan, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland.

The Catholic Biblical Association will co-operate with the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in the observance of Biblical Sunday. For 1942, Septuagesima Sunday, February 1, has been selected. On this Sunday the Church commences the reading of the book of Genesis in the Divine Office. This seems to be the reason for the selection of this Sunday. It is hoped to have an annual observance of Biblical Sunday. Incidentally, Biblical Sunday promises to become international. The ecclesiastical authorities of England are much interested. Enquiries have been made regarding our May 18, 1941, observance of Biblical Sunday.

The following letter of commendation of two recently published works comes from Vatican City:

SEGRETERIA DI STATO
Di Sva Santita

Dal Vaticano, October 14, 1941

Dear Father Callan,

The Holy Father directs me to inform you that He has received the copies of your recent books, The Parables of Christ, and of the Spencer New Testament, which you and Father McHugh have edited. His Holiness would have me tell you of His deep appreciation, not only of your devoted thoughtfulness in forwarding Him copies of these outstanding works but also of the long hours and scholarly effort which you have given to these praiseworthy endeavors. He is confident that you will derive great consolation from the knowledge that through your conscientious labors countless thousands may be brought to a greater knowledge and love of the Sacred Scriptures.

In token of His grateful benevolence and as a pledge of copious heavenly recompense, the Sovereign Pontiff imparts to you His special Apostolic Benediction.

Gladly availing myself of this occasion to express to you my own cordial appreciation of the copies of these outstanding works, which you sent to me, and my congratulations on the success which you have achieved in these most recent endeavors, I remain,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

(Signed) L. Card. Maglione

The Rev. Charles J. Callan, O.P.,
Hawthorne, N. Y.

FATHER WILLIAM J. McGARRY, S.J.

The death of Father Wiliam J. McGarry, S.J., in New York on September 23, 1941, brought to its end, at the age of forty-six, a life which had already seen a great deal accomplished, but which was just beginning to reach its real fruition in the field of Catholic learning.

Father McGarry was born on March 14 in Hamilton, Massachusetts. As a youth he attended Boston College, and even in these younger days he was distinguished as a serious student and an ardent defender of the Faith. He entered the Society of Jesus at St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. in 1911. Following the regular Jesuit curriculum (Noviceship, Classical Studies, Philosophy) for his first seven years he continued to be outstanding as a student. He then taught for four years at Fordham University, in the meantime earning his doctor's degree in Philosophy. His Theological studies were made at Woodstock, Maryland (1922-1926). Because of his outstanding ability he was assigned after a year of Tertianship (1927) to teach on the newly inaugurated Theological Faculty at Weston. For the year 1928 he taught some exegesis and the treatise on Inspiration. From the beginning those who attended his lectures were high in their praise of his knowledge and his teaching ability.

After this year of teaching he was sent to the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome (1929-1931) to obtain his Licentiate in Sacred Scripture. While there he did not confine himself merely to the prescribed courses. He studied, besides the required languages, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Coptic. Such a program naturally did not make him a finished and profound scholar in these languages, but the notes he left behind at Weston testify to the fact that his work in any of the fields he entered was never superficial. These same notes (among them several mimeographed volumes) are also evidence of the care with which he prepared his classes in the New Testament.

Almost from the beginning of his appointment as New Testament Professor at Weston Father McGarry's interest in the advancement of studies warranted his being entrusted with the important post of Prefect of Studies for both the Philosophical and Theological Faculties. Those who studied at Weston during this period of Father McGarry's life all remember him as being most zealous in his encouragement of the young students in all branches of intellectual endeavor. After six years (1931-1937) at Weston he took over (out of obedience, for he preferred his work in the Scholasticate) the Rectorship of Boston College.

His short stay (1937-1939) at Boston College was marked again by his enthusiasm for anything which would advance studies. Characteristically one of the chief accomplishments of his Rectorship was the splendid reorganization of the Library. Ill health, however, interfered with his work as Rector, and he was glad to be relieved in 1939 to take up the task of launching the new periodical, *Theological Studies*, which had been planned for several years. Back in his proper element, he launched the new undertaking after enthusiastic but careful preparation. The work and care which he lavished on this new venture is shown by the fact that after less than two years he left the young periodical thriving in every way.

In the meantime he had planned a series of books on scriptural subjects, the first two of which (*Paul and the Crucified* and *Unto the End*) had appeared before his death, another (*He Cometh*) was still in the press. These books were to make known outside his own religious family what had long been known to that restricted circle almost exclusively, his deep spirituality.

The heart ailment which finally brought about his death had manifested itself months before his death. But after each attack he returned contentedly to work. He seems to have felt that his years were to be short in any case, and that it was better to die working rather than to escape death by living in inactivity. He knew that each attack might be the last and met its approach (as he himself said) by making acts of perfect love of God. He died while on his way to give the Spiritual Exercises to a community of nuns. Truly it can be said of him that he died on the field of battle.

R. I. P.

JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.

BOOK REVIEWS

JOHN E. STEINMUELLER, S.T.D., S.S.L., *A Companion to Scripture Studies* (New York: Joseph Wagner Inc., 1941). Pp. X, 478. $3.85.

It can be said without exaggeration that there is no branch of learning connected with the Bible which is more important than Introduction. While all other studies in this sacred field converge on an explanation of the meaning of the text of Holy Scripture and are intended for it, the foregoing statement is still true, because without Introduction that one most desired end cannot be adequately attained. As we know, the Bible is a collection of ancient books ranging over many centuries, written by many different authors in languages strange to us of the modern and Western world, composed amidst conditions and circumstances very foreign to peoples of the Occident, and embodying an immense variety of subject-matter, through all of which is conveyed a special divine revelation to mankind embracing a great number of spiritual and supernatural teachings and doctrine which human beings could never by their own natural powers have acquired. A glance at these facts and circumstances makes it clear and beyond question that our aim and effort to understand the Sacred Text must begin far off and be preceded by a careful and thorough knowledge of a vast multitude of related subjects, such as history, geography, ethnology, and palaeology, and the like; and all this before we come to the more proximate study of the ancient particular people and languages which God used as mediums and vehicles through which to speak in a special manner to the world and communicate sacred truths and rites otherwise unknown to our race.

Nor is this the extent of our preparation. The rich and varied literature contained in the Bible, by reason of its very nature and purpose, is unlike any other writings we know of. It was written by human beings, indeed, but under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God. Those authors and compilers, thus assisted, conceived clearly and executed faithfully the message which God gave them to make known. Of this heavenly influence, consequently, we need to learn, not only of its existence, but something also of its nature, extent, and effects, besides the means by which it can be discerned as the stamp which sets apart the Sacred Writings from all other literature. After that we must be made acquainted with the process and rules which guided the responsible leaders and teachers of God's people under the Old Covenant and under the New in distinguishing and selecting the inspired books from out the mass of other writings and designating them genuine and canonical as opposed to the spurious and uncanonical or apocryphal. Our next step will be to learn something about the nature, characteristics, and history of the ancient languages in which the Scriptures were first composed, as well as of the many ancient and modern tongues into which they have been translated. This done, we are ready to be instructed regarding the scientific rules which have directed others down the centuries and which must govern us in interpreting and understanding the Sacred Text, enabling us to discover the various meanings which may underlie the words and phrases used by the inspired authors.

All this is only the barest outline of what a general Introduction to Sacred Scripture must do; but from it we can see what an enormous task rests upon him who would carry it out in detail. Add to this a particular Introduction to each of the sacred books, discussing the author, language, time and place of writing, readers, purpose, contents, etc., of each separate book of the Bible, and we shall have some conception of what may be expected from the author of such a work.

Now since this study is essential to an understanding of the Bible, we cannot suppose that we have been without it all along, even in our own language. No, we have had before now and for long various Introductions to the study of the Sacred Scriptures; but in many respects they have not been satisfactory. Some of them have been too long, which, however, in spite of their length, have omitted much necessary matter. Others have been too brief and fragmentary. Still others have been inexact, or behind the times, or too unpractical and uninviting in their arrangement and presentation of the subjects treated.

Both professors and students have been wishing for many years that we had an adequate, up-to-date work of this kind. It seems scholars have hesitated to put their hand to it, being only too well aware of its vast requirements. But at last, thank heaven, in the book before us we seem to have the first of the two volumes of a work such as we have been looking for. This volume is a general Introduction to the Bible and the coming volume will be a particular Introduction to each of the sacred books.

Judging by this first part of a two-volume work, we are finally to have the very kind of study we have desired so long. It appeals to the present reviewer as in every way quite satisfactory, surveying, as it does, the whole background and the approaches to the Holy Scriptures, treating the required material in lucid order, thoroughly and practically, and combining the best of ancient and latest learning within limits which should please all students and professors.

Here, then, we have a work which we feel safe in praising in high terms. The author's learning and fitness for his task are beyond question, his judgment and method are of the best, his experience in teaching and writing have complemented and perfected a thorough preparation and background. The publishers, too, deserve unstinted praise for producing a splendid specimen of the book-makers' art. The arrangement, size and styles of print, the paper, binding, general and particular make-up, appear to us to be as near perfect as they could be made.

Finally, several attractive maps and an Appendix containing the text of the Muratorian Fragment, the official decrees of the Council of Trent, the Encyclical Letters on Holy Scripture of recent Popes, and a long alphabetical index, complete the first volume of this very useful and commendable work. Every student and professor in the country will want to possess it and will be grateful for it.

C. J. CALLAN, O.P.

MILLAR BURROWS, PH.D., *What Mean These Stones?* The Significance of Archeology for Biblical Studies (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941). Pp. xvi, 306. Frontispiece, 58 figures and 2 end-sheet maps. $2.50.

Professor Burrows has been closely associated with archaeologists and archaeological work for a number of years. In 1931-2, he was the director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. Since 1934, he has been the president of the American Schools of Oriental Research (Jerusalem and Baghdad), and has had occasion to handle many archaeological reports and to edit some of them for publication. He is also the Winkley Professor of Biblical Theology at Yale University, where he is giving special attention to the evaluation of archaeological discoveries in reference to biblical matters.

Feeling that "a great deal of current writing on archeology and the Bible misses the mark," he has endeavored in this book "to put the whole matter in its true light." Extravagant claims are being made by Bible enthusiasts, which he believes are misleading and mischievous even though intended for the glory of God. From the vast amount of pertinent material available, he has chosen several hundred interesting items of a representative character, to indicate the nature and extent of the confirmation that archaeology has been able to make thus far. For the most part, this confirmation has been quite of a general kind. Confirmation of specific details in the biblical narratives is rather rare. A good example of the latter (p. 282) is a tablet containing the name of "Yaukin king of the land of Yahud" to whom a subvention of grain and oil had been granted at the court of Babylon (See 4 Kings 25:30).

In the introductory chapter attention is called to the difficulties raised in modern times against biblical inspiration and inerrancy, and to the type of help possible from archaeology. Professor Burrows maintains rightly that after all "much of what is said in the Bible, and that by far the most important part, cannot be tested by archeological evidence." A brief account is given of archaeological field procedure and of the interpretation of materials.

The second chapter considers biblical manuscripts and their textual problems; also the supplementary help furnished by comparative linguistics. In the third chapter, a general orientation is indicated by way of topography and chronology. The Bronze and Iron Ages, and the Hellenistic and Roman periods are sketched as a setting for biblical times. Then follow two interesting chapters, the one treating the material and secular background, the other the religious and ethical background. A final chapter gives the general evaluation, considering not only the various confirmations offered by archaeology, but also a number of difficulties raised by it. The concluding paragraphs indicate the relation of archaeology to exegesis and to higher criticism. There is a serviceable index of persons and subjects, another of places, and a third of scriptural references.

The book is crammed with information, yet interestingly written and comparatively easy to read. The 58 figures were well chosen. At the outset, Prof. Burrows stated that he was writing with a frankly and definitely religious interest, and from the point of view of a liberal Protestant Christian, but apart from a few statements touching inspiration, there is little with which a Catholic teacher of the Sacred Scriptures need disagree on religious grounds, and much that may be genuinely useful.

EDWARD A. CERNY, S.S.

HERMANN VOGELSTEIN, *Rome, a History of the Jews in Rome.* Translated from the German by Moses Hadas (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1940). Pp. XIII, 421.

In general this book is very good. It is enlightening, interesting, and except where it touches on questions which concern Christianity and Catholicism in Rome, it is calm and objective. Of course just a hasty review of the sources used and quoted shows the studied intention never to consider the Christian side or sources of a historical question. The author's appraisal of Josephus and of his writings is a final example of his scholarship when he is freed from inborn prejudices, while his appraisals of Eusebius and St. Justin are samples of how childish he can be when he allows prejudice to upset his calm judgment or when he does not know the works about which he is writing.

There is much material here, treated from a different angle, which will serve well to illustrate St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and the lives of St. Peter and St. Paul that have been written by Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

E. A. MANGAN

ALBERT E. BARNETT, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941). Pp. XIII, 277. $2.50.

This study is a detailed comparison of the epistle to the Ephesians with certain collected Pauline epistles to which it is supposed to be the pseudonymous preface, and then of the entire collection and its preface with other supposedly later New Testament books and with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and early Apologists. Dr. Barnett's purpose is to present the pertinent literary data as an aid to the intelligent appraisal of Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed's theory relative to the origin of the epistle to the Ephesians. This theory is persuasively and attractively presented by Dr. Goodspeed in several books (*An Introduction to the New Testament* (1937); *The Meaning of Ephesians* (1933); *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (1927) et al.).

The theory is briefly: The publication of Luke-Acts stimulated interest in the missionary activity of Paul and led some discerning but unknown individual (Dr. Goodspeed thinks it may have been Onesimus, rescued from slavery and oblivion by Paul's letter to Philemon) to gather together and "publish" the Apostle's epistles so that he might speak through them to the Church. The Ephesian epistle was written by the collector to serve as a sort of preface to the collection. The pseudonymous writer borrowed copiously from all the Pauline epistles known to him and included in his collection. Dr. Barnett's data in his book's first chapter is intended to show the extent of that borrowing.

The theory also supposes that the "publication of the Pauline letters with their pseudonymous preface" was a great stimulus to literary activity, and to help establish that hypothesis the author compares the collected letters and preface with all the New Testament books which he thinks originated after the assembled letters had been "published," and with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists. These New Testament writings (the Apocalypse, 1 and 2 Peter, Hebrews, the Gospel according to St. John, the Johannine epistles, James, Jude, and the Pastoral epistles, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus) appeared, the author thinks, sometime during the period beginning with the last decade of the first century and extending well into the second half of the second century.

Dr. Barnett thinks that immediately after the "publication" of the Pauline corpus it enjoyed great popularity and was widely used by Christian writers, canonical and non-canonical, of the period 90-125 A.D. He presents what he considers evidence of literary dependence in proof of this hypothesis. Then there followed a period, about 125-150, during which the popularity of Paul's letters suffered eclipse because he had been espoused by the heretics, especially Marcion. Evidence for this decline in popularity the author seeks in the comparative absence of literary dependence on Paul in works appearing during this period, James, Jude, Shepherd of Hermas, epistle of Barnabas, the Didache, etc.

The second half of the second century was marked by a return of Paul's letters to popularity, and evidence for this is sought in the literary dependence on Paul of writings appearing during this period. The author investigates 2 Peter, the Pastoral epistles, Tatian's address to the Greeks, the writings of Justin, et al.

Such briefly is the plan of the book.

Dr. Barnett's method is to give the Greek text of the writing under examination and parallel it with the Greek text of the author who is supposed to have borrowed from it. In each case of comparison the degree of dependence, as the author sees it, is indicated by the letters "A," "B" and "C," which respectively serve to grade the dependence as practically certain, highly probable and reasonably probable. References, without citations of texts, are given to passages which may possibly be reminiscences of the writing under examination, and finally at the end of each section there is a tabulation of results.

The discovery of literary dependence is, we think, highly subjective. Dr. Barnett has some misgivings about it, admitting that it is "somewhat subjective" (p. x), yet he thinks that "the general story... can be confidently accepted." For example, comparing Ephesians 1:5 with Rom. 8:29, and basing his argument on two words *υἱοθεσία* and *προορίζειν* (the two words are used in conjunction in the former passage, but in the latter ninety-three words intervene between them), Dr. Barnett concludes that literary dependence is certain (p. 5). That, it seems to us, is rather shaky ground on which to base a conclusion which can reasonably be classified as *certain*. Another example: Comparing 1 Tim. 1:8 with Rom. 7:7,12,16, the author concludes from the bare statement found in both passages that the Law is good (*καλός*), that there is literary dependence of the former on the latter. The idea is a primary deduction from basic Christian principles, and must have been the view of all genuine early Christian teachers, and therefore from the fact that the two writers (supposing for the sake of argument but not granting that there were two writers) make the statement, one is hardly justified in concluding to literary dependence. Yet Dr. Barnett classes this case in category "A," i.e. as "practically certain." The foregoing are not isolated instances.

We must object strenuously to the author's dating—sometimes implicit and sometimes explicit—of some of the New Testament books. Thus 1 Peter is assigned to 90 or later; James and Jude to the opening quarter of the second century; 2 Peter to the second half of the second century. Neither do we like his idea that the epistles of St. Paul suffered an eclipse in popularity owing to the use made of them by Marcion. Once the epistles were firmly established as the authentic letters of Paul, no intelligent Christian would shy away from them because they happened to be misunderstood by a heretic. Apostolic authorship gave authority to a book in the eyes of the early Church.

But regardless of what one may think of Professor Goodspeed's theory, regardless of the dates assumed by Dr. Barnett for some New Testament writings, and regardless of how one may disagree with his classification of literary dependence, his work should prove to be a useful and handy tool for anyone who is studying the interesting and important question of literary dependence as between various New Testament books and early non-canonical Christian writers. The book gathers the data and makes the comparative study a much easier task than it otherwise would have been, and therefore we are pleased to recommend Dr. Barnett's *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* from that standpoint and commend him for his painstaking efforts in assembling this material.

There are no scriptural or topical indices, but in a book of this kind that is no disavantage.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON, *The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940). Pp. VII, 337.

This attractive volume was produced by the collaboration of seven men. The title does not convey an entirely accurate idea of the contents. Only the Hebrew Bible and the Greek, Latin, Syrac and English versions are treated in any detail. Of the other ancient versions, the Coptic, Ethiopic and Gothic are passed over in a brief note. The Arabic, Georgic, Armenian and the Targums are barely mentioned. The aim of the contributors is to "make old knowledge accessible .... though incidentally their researches may have added something to the common stock." It is not surprising, then, that there is little, if anything, new for the mature professional student. The volume, however, appeals rather to the professional student at the outset of his studies and to the reader of general education. For these the book will be extremely serviceable, containing, as it does, a wealth of information on the character of Hebrew, the formation of the canon, the growth of the versions, their characteristics and critical value, the chief manuscripts and the critical editions of the different bibles. An omission should be noted in the list of the critical editions of the Greek N.T. For some unaccountable reason, Vogels' and Merk's editions are not mentioned.

About one half of the book is given over to a treatment of the English versions from the Anglo-Saxon period to the present time. These chapters—there are four of them—are the most thorough of the book. The emphasis is of course on the Authorized and the Revised versions. The popular Protestant views that there was no English version of the Bible prior to Wyclif, and that vernacular versions had never been regarded with favor by the Church are given further circulation. Something might have been said about later revisions of the Douay-Rheims version; e.g., Challoner. In listing the Jewish translations made in the period after the Revised version, one misses the version put out under the joint auspices of the Jewish Publication Society of America, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis in 1917.

The book concludes with a chapter by the editor in which he expounds his views on inspiration, revelation, faith, function and authority of the Bible. The volume is furnished with a handy, though limited, bibliography for each chapter, a chronological table, and indices of persons, subjects, and scriptural references. All in all a helpful, convenient book.

J. P. WEISSENGOFF

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Some of these may be reviewed in subsequent issues)

Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York City, N. Y.:

A Companion to Scripture Studies. General Introduction, By the Rev. John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.S.L. 1941. Pp. x, 478. $3.85.

Youth Guidance. By the Rev. Kilian J. Hennrich, O.F.M.Cap., A.M. 1941. Pp. v, 314. $2.25.

The American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven, Conn.:

What Mean These Stones? The Significance of Archeology for Biblical Studies. By Millar Burrows, Ph.D. 1941. Pp. xvi, 306. $2.50.

Jewish Publication Society, Phila., Pa.:

A Scientfic Hebrew Grammar for Beginners. By Simon Yungfleisch, C.P. 1941. Pp. xiii, 141. $2.50.

The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.:

Tongues of Fire. A Bible Composed of Sacred Scriptures of the Non-Christian World. Compiled by Grace H. Turnbull. 1941. Pp. xxvi, 422. $3.50.

Confraternity of the Precious Blood, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

My Daily Reading from the New Testament. Using the new translation prepared under the direction of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. Arranged by Rev. Joseph F. Stedman. 1941. Pp. 576. $.25.

C. Wildermann Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.:

The Gems of Prayer. A Manual of Prayers and Devotional Exercises. 1941. Pp. 199. $1.00.

Watkins Printing Co., Baltimore, Md.:

Good Works and Predestination according to Thomas of Strassburg, O.S.A. A Dissertation for the Doctorate in the Faculty of Theology of the Pontifical Gregorian University. By the Rev. L. Shannon, O.S.A. 1941. Pp. 144. $2.00.

St. Charles Seminary, Carthagena, Ohio:

Nuntius Aulae. July 1941. Pp. 204.

INITIAL PUBLICATIONS OF

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly

The Confraternity Edition of the New Testament

The Sunday Epistles and Gospels

IN PREPARATION

A Brief Commentary on the Revised New Testament

A Series of Scholarly Commentaries on Each of the Books of the Bible

A Revision of the Challoner-Douay Old Testament

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION

Within the past five years, since its organization in 1936, THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION has sponsored three major projects: *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* The Confraternity Edition of the Revised New Testament, and The Sunday Epistles and Gospels (with Commentary) for pulpit use. Considerable progress has been made on the Revision of the Challoner-Douay Old Testament; a brief Commentary on the books of the New Testament, for Study Clubs and the Laity, will soon be ready for publication; and a scholarly and scientific commentary on each of the books of the Bible is planned.

An Invitation:

To carry on effectively and efficiently this monumental work which promises to be so fruitful in lasting results the Clergy, Religious Communities, and the Laity are invited to co-operate. This co-operation may take the form of a subscription to *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* or of an enrollment in THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL QUARTERLY

The official organ of The Catholic Biblical Association of America, *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* is published in January, April, July, and October. This publication, each number of which carries 96-120 pages, is of special interest to the Clergy, Religious Communities, and Educational Institutions. The regular perusal of *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* will keep its readers in touch with the work of Catholic Biblical Scholars throughout the world, and will do much to arouse and sustain interest in the Sacred Scriptures. The content of the first two volumes, listed below, will give a general idea of the character of *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly.*

CONTENTS OF VOLUME ONE

The Essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass and Scripture, John McHugh, O.P., S.T.M., Litt. D.
The Seventy Weeks, Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.D.
The Synoptic Problem, Charles Callan, O.P., S.T.M., Litt.D.
Our Lord and the Pharisees, W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.
The Newly Proposed Translation of Genesis 2:5-6, W. H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.
Witness of the Early Church to the Authorship of the Gospels, W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.
The Eschatological Discourse, A. C. Cotter, S.J., S.T.D.
The Urim and Thummim, E. A. Mangan, C.Ss.R., S.S.L.
The Professors of Scripture and the Discussion Study Club, J. F. Rowan, S.S.L.
A Recent Life of Christ, Charles Callan, O.P., S.T.M., Litt.D.
The Curriculum of Scriptural Studies in our Seminaries, Edward Byrne, S.T.D.
St. Mark the Disciple of St. Peter and St. Paul, W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.
The Supernatural Origin of Israel's Religion, John J. Dougherty, S.S.L.
Father Lagrange on Jesus and His Message, Edward Byrne, S.T.D.
Christ's Self-abasement, A. A. Stephenson, S.J.
St. Luke, W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.
"The Waters of Refreshment," John Quasten, S.T.D.
"House" or "Business" in Lk. 2:49?, Patrick J. Temple, D.D.

Besides the more lengthy articles, each number of *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* carries as regular features: "The Obscurities of the Latin Psalter," by William H. McClellan, a very helpful series; "The Archaeological Corner," which discusses the latest developments in the important field of Archaeology, by Edward Cerny, S.S., S.T.D.; other regular features are carried under the general headings of Exegetical Notes, Problems of Bible Revision, Survey of Periodical Literature (commenced in Volume III), Biblical News, Book Reviews.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND RETRIBUTION IN THIS LIFE

The teaching of the Old Testament on retribution in this life is sometimes charged with being exaggerated, unjust, or even contradictory. We propose, therefore, to examine this teaching, especially that part of it which relates to solidarity in punishment, which we shall designate as social retribution. This consisted in the fact that a social unit, such as the family or the nation, was afflicted because of the transgression of one or more of its members.

A striking feature of the Old Testament is the emphasis which it lays upon individual retribution in this life. This is especially manifest in the Psalms and the Wisdom literature. An exhaustive enumeration of all the relevant passages is unnecessary; we shall confine ourselves to the following representative statements; God rewards every man according to his works (Ecclus. 16:14). The good man reaps the harvest of his deeds, but he who goes wrong must take the consequences (Prov. 14:14). The righteous man enjoys peace of soul (Ps. 22:4; 27:1); long days and a happy life (Ps. 24:13; Prov. 3:2); health (Ps. 40:3; Prov. 3:8); abundant harvests (Ps. 143:13; Prov. 3:10); wealth and honor (Ps. 111:3; Prov. 3:16; 8:21). God clears the way for him (Prov. 3:6); he need not fear sudden blows (Prov. 3:25). Even if he possesses little, he fares better than a man who is wealthy but godless (Ps. 36:16). A single virtuous man may build up a city, but a group of wicked men can be its ruin (Ecclus. 16:4). His posterity will be numerous and glorious (Ps. 111:2; 126:3; 127:3).

The godless man, on the contrary, will never go unpunished (Prov. 11:21). Whatever he fears, will befall him (Prov. 10:24). His prosperity is illusory (Ps. 36:1 ff.); he will be snared by his misdeeds (Prov. 5:22). He is like chaff before the wind (Ps. 1:4; 34:5) and without footing in the land (Prov. 10:30). He withers early like grass on the housetops (Ps. 128:6); doom strikes him suddenly (Prov. 6:15). His posterity is accursed (Ps. 36:38; 51:7; 68:26; 108:12).

Instances of individual retribution are related in the Second Book of Machabees and the Book of Wisdom. The former recounts in great detail how certain conspicuous desecrators of the sanctuary were punished in a manner corresponding to the na-

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

ture of their crimes: Jason (5:9), Antiochus Epiphanes (9:18), Menelaus (13:8), Nicanor (15:31-37). The latter points out how certain afflictions which befell the Egyptians fitted the peculiar character of their sins: 11:6,8,15; 15:18–16:1; 17:2–18:4.

Hence these books have been accused of championing the naive popular view of the Jews about the rigorous nature of retribution in this life[1] But these books merely teach that God occasionally chastises egregious malefactors with proportionate penalties in this life; they do not pronounce this to be an immutable law of Divine Providence. This is the meaning of the wise man when he declares that a man is punished by the instrument of his sin (Wis. 11:16), for he admits that the lot of the wicked in this life may be comparatively happy (2:6 ff.).

Similarly, the other Scriptural statements which we have quoted above can be criticized adversely only if they are interpreted as signifying that God invariably rewards the good and punishes the wicked in the manner described. But there is nothing in their wording to compel us to accept this rigid interpretation. They are not scientific definitions but aphorisms or popular sayings which express the consequences frequently resulting from virtue or vice, without attending to possible exceptions. As a matter of fact, the good man is never utterly without some reward in this life, and the evil man invariably experiences some retribution even though it be purely mental and even though he may suceed in concealing his unhappiness from the world.

The resemblances of the sanctions enunciated in these texts is evident from the fact that they do not differ appreciably from those taught by experience. This shows that, in the individual order, remorse, bitterness, disease, and premature death are often the effect of sin and dissipation and that mental and bodily health are promoted by a virtuous life. In the social sphere, moral integrity wins esteem and fosters the qualities which make for success and national prosperity. Vice, on the other hand, is a frequent cause of poverty and failure; if left unchecked, it brings about national disaster.

Social retribution was practiced by the kings of Israel. This is clear from the praise lavished upon Amasias for sparing the lives of the sons of the conspirators against his father (4 Kgs. 14:6). But this unjust practice is utterly against the criminal code established by Moses. The judges who are to administer the execution of this code are instructed, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children for the fathers, but every one shall die for his own sins" (Deut. 24:16). Nor can a single statute be found which decrees the punishment of one member of a family for the crime committed by another.

---

[1] Bousset, *Religion des Judentums,* p. 411 ff.

In this respect, the Mosaic Law stands in marked contrast to other legal codes of the ancient Near East. Thus, the code of Hammurabi[2] ordains that if a newly built house collapses and kills a child of the inmates, a child of the builder responsible for the accident is to be executed. According to the Assyrian code[3] the wife of a man guilty of rape was subject to the same act of violence.

There is one ordinance of Moses, however, which departs from this rigorous rule of individual retribution for personal crime in the sense that it condemns children together with their guilty parents. If an Israelite city has been convicted of forsaking the religion of its fathers and embracing idolatry, it is to be devoted to the ban: all its inhabitants without exception and all its cattle are to be slain; the city itself and all its spoil are to be burnt; nothing found in the city is to be appropriated; anyone violating these regulations is threatened with dire divine punishment (Deut. 13:13-19).

A similar moral problem arises from the injunction which Moses gave to the Israelites on the eve of the conquest of western Palestine: the Canaanites were to be utterly exterminated (Deut. 7:8), no one that breathed was to be left alive (Deut. 20:16). In a previous discourse Moses glories in the fact that the Israelites utterly destroyed the men and the women and the children of the cities of Sehon (Deut: 2:34) and that they smote the subjects of Og until none survived (Deut. 3:3). The Book of Josue reveals how scrupulously the command of Moses concerning the Canaanites was obeyed on not a few occasions: 6:21; 8:22; 10:28-40; 11:11-21.

The motive of Moses in issuing these commands is unimpeachable: he wished to guard his people against the dangers of idolatry and immorality resulting from the association with the Canaanites and apostate Israelites. But may he be charged with excessive cruelty? This seems to be the opinion of the Catholic commentator, Junker.[4] He considers this Mosaic ordinance about the Canaanites to be morally imperfect, not sanctioned by God, but merely tolerated in the same sense that He permitted Moses to pass a law concerning divorce which did not correspond to the pure will of God with regard to matrimony but was morally imperfect on account of the hard-heartedness of the Jews (Mt. 19:8).

---

[2] Deimel, *Codex Hammurabi,* No. 230.

[3] Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte,* p. 421, No. 54.

We grant that the Mosaic law of divorce did not conform to the high ideals of matrimony proclaimed in the garden of Eden (Gen. 2:24) and reaffirmed by Jesus Christ (Mt. 19:6). But it was not morally imperfect in the sense that it deviated from the norm of morality and was objectively sinful and reprehensible. Since divorce did not defeat the primary purpose of marriage and for this reason did not nullify the natural law, God could grant this privilege to the Israelites and they could avail themselves of it under the proper conditions without the least qualm of conscience. Hence there is no reason to think that divorce in the Old Testament was not sanctioned by God. Nor is there any other law of the Pentateuch which could be said to have been merely tolerated and not divinely sanctioned. Consequently, we cannot argue from analogy that the slaughter of the Canaanites was not positively approved by God. Moreover, the case of the Canaanites is parallel to that of the Amalecites, whom the Lord explicitly commanded to be slain, without regard to age or sex (1 Kgs. 15:3 ff).

In fact, it is not difficult to justify the massacre of such idolatrous Israelites and Canaanites as had attained the full use of reason. They rejected the true God and worshipped deities of their own devising, whom they honored with abominable rites (Lev. 18:21; 20:2; Deut. 12:31; 18:9-12). Thus, according to St. Paul, they were guilty of grave sin (Rom. 1:18 ff.). God, therefore, could condemn them to death and appoint the Israelites to be the executioners of His sentence. He had already granted the Canaanites a long time for repentance (Gen. 15:16); he was not obliged to do this, nor to send them prophets to warn them of the impending catastrophe. Even had they done penance like the Ninivites, they could still have been punished by temporal death for their past sins.

---

[4] *Deuteronomium*, p. 50.

Nor is the slaughter of the innocent children so indefensible as might appear at first sight. We may argue that they should have been adopted by the Israelites and brought up in the true religion. But God may have foreseen that they would revert to the idolatry of their parents and corrupt the Israelites. In this supposition their death was an act of mercy to them personally and to the chosen people. Human authority could not deprive them of life to prevent crimes of the distant future, but the Supreme Lord of life and death could do so. Even if He foresaw that they would prove to be faithful, He could still have had adequate motives for destroying them. The proclivity of the Israelites to idolatry and its concomitant turpitude was terrific (Ez. 23:1 ff.); they needed a convincing demonstration that this sin was extremely hateful to God. This they received when they saw that the guilty idolaters as well as every object and every person connected with them were destroyed.

Moreover, this complete annihilation served as a warning to the Israelites not to imitate the depravity of the doomed race, lest they, too, lose, not only their lives and their property, but also their beloved children, in whom they hoped to survive upon this earth. Death did not rob these children of their essential right to enjoy God in a state of natural happiness: they lost the possibility of gaining supernatural bliss, but this is a pure grace, which God is not bound to bestow upon every one. In this regard their fate was no worse than that of infants of the present day who die without baptism through human culpability or the operation of purely natural causes.

Obviously, the treatment accorded to the Canaanites is not proposed as a standard regulating the behavior of a Christian state towards one which is infidel, heretic or schismatic. A Christian people can only wage war to safeguard its rights; without explicit divine authorization it can neither chastise another people for merely professing a false religion nor slay innocent persons.

Social retribution is, also, threatened for the commission of any grave sin, no matter what its nature may be. In Ex. 20:5,6 (Deut. 5:9-10) the Lord motivates His demand for exclusive worship with the words: "For I Yahweh, thy God, am a zealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, and showing mercy unto the thousandth generation of these who love me and keep my commandments." God, therefore, declares that he will punish the posterity of those who hate Him and reward the posterity of those who love Him because of the respective demerits or merits of their fathers. But he hates God who transgresses any divine precept of grave import, and no one can love God unless he observes all His commandments which oblige under grave sin. Consequently, the reward promised in the text applies to the observance of all the commandments, and the punishment concerns the transgression of any one of them in a matter of vital consequence.

The reference to the third and fourth generation need not be pressed; it is merely a concrete way of saying that the chastisement may extend for several generations. The allusion to the thousandth generation vividly expresses the thought that the reward to be bestowed on God's friends will be immeasurably greater than the retribution to be visited upon His enemies. Both the threat and the promise are conditional; they declare what God may do if He finds it wise and good. They do not enunciate an invariable course of action, nor do they exclude the possibility that God may restrict his chastisement or reward to fewer generations or even omit them altogether. This conclusion is based on experience and on the fact that similar threats and promises in the Old Testament are likewise conditional (3 Kgs. 21:24,29; Jer. 24:6,7).

Despite these limitations, the threat of punishment to the posterity of the wicked seems harsh. An effort has been made to eliminate this harshness by interpreting the passage to mean that the sins of the fathers will be visited on the children only if these, too, are wicked, and that the children of the good will be rewarded only if they, too, are faithful.[5] But this interpretation grants no special reward to good children because of parental fidelity; such a reward seems to be required by the context, which contrasts them with the children of the wicked who are punished because of parental sin. Moreover, this interpretation is forced and does not accord with the syntax[6] nor with other passages of the Pentateuch, which state categorically, without the possibility of being understood in any other way, that children will suffer because of the iniquity of their parents (Ex. 34:7; Num. 14:18).

The severity of this doctrine is mitigated somewhat by the consideration that the subjective guilt of the father is not imputed to the children, so that they are not being punished in the rigorous scientific sense, which implies expiation for personal guilt. But this clarifies but one aspect of the problem. Even if we say that the father is being chastised in the children,[7] we are still confronted by the fact that the children, though guiltless, are bearing the penalty incurred by another's sin.

---

[5] Finkelstein, *The Pharisees*, I, p. 150.

[6] Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique*, No. 130 b.

Some have tried to soften the seeming asperity of the doctrine by saying that it refers to the natural consequences of parental transgression, such as disease, poverty, disgrace, social ostracism etc.[8] It undoubtedly comprises these, but it is not restricted to them; it also refers to misfortunes due to a special intervention of Providence. Thus, David is punished by the premature demise of his infant son (1 Kgs. 12:14); the highpriest of Bethel, by the degradation of his wife and the violent death of his sons (Am. 7:17); Achab, by the ghastly fate of his heir and successor (3 Kgs. 14:29; 4 Kgs. 9:26).

Social retribution is, also, visited upon the nation of Israel for the sins of the majority. At the very birth of the nation Moses had threatened it with all manner of misfortunes in case of infidelity. The historical and prophetic writings show how faithfully this threat was carried into effect.

The nation could even suffer in consequence of the delinquency of an individual. The defeat of the Israelites at Ai was caused by the disobedience of Achan (Jos. 7:1); a famine befell Israel because of Saul's brutality to the Gabaonites (2 Kgs. 21:1 ff); a pestilence raged because of David's pride (2 Kgs. 24:1 ff.).

Temporal punishment is reasonable in all the cases of social retribution which we have considered thus far. But why was it not restricted to the guilty? The solution is based upon the solidarity which exists among the members of a family and a nation. God did not use this solidarity to impute the guilt of one to all: this would be irrational and unjust. But He employed it to manifest the gravity of the offence committed against Himself. The Hebrews realized this from the fact that the punishment due to the offender affected other parts of the moral organism to which he belonged, just as they recognized the seriousness of an infection from the fact that the whole body was racked by pain. The injury sustained by the family or nation also meant material loss or at least mental anguish to the sinner. In this way he, also, was compelled to make reparation for his misdeeds. In addition, the prospect that the family or the nation which they loved and whose welfare was interwoven with their own might suffer grievously, deterred others from committing similar sins.

---

[7] Fernandez, "El Castigo de los Hijos," *Estudios Eclesiasticos*, 1923, pp. 419-426.

[8] Hummelauer, *Exodus*, in locum.

The afflictions of the innocent under these circumstances could only be deemed objectionable if they conflicted with the rights which God guaranteed to them by virtue of their creation or elevation to a supernatural state. But God could not place them in a world absolutely free from physical evil even if He wished, and the relative immunity which mankind was destined to enjoy was lost by original sin. Moreover physical evil, whether it be inherent in the finite nature of created things or caused by human or diabolic agents or inflicted by a special disposition of Divine Providence, does not defeat the purpose for which man was created, which is to glorify God and so attain his eternal happiness. If wisely used, it promotes the achievement of this purpose. It withdraws man from the allurements of sense to the contemplation of spiritual values, forces him to have recourse to suppliant prayer, purifies him from lesser defects and guards him against greater, affords him an opportunity to show that his service is disinterested and to practice the theological and moral virtues even to the point of heroism, thus enabling him to gain rich merit for eternity. These advantages could be gained even in the obscurity and relative spiritual poverty of the Old Testament, as is evident from the Psalms and the Book of Job.

The Jews contemporaneous with Jeremias and Ezechiel were convinced that God visits the sins of the fathers upon the children (Jer. 32:18). Hence, in their blindness and obduracy, they blamed their national calamities upon the iniquity of former generations and crystallized their perverse conclusion in a proverb which became current in Juda and Babylonia:

> "The fathers have eaten sour grapes
> and the teeth of the children are blunted" (Ez. 18:2).

Jeremias consoled the Jews who quoted this proverb to him with the prospect of an ideal age in which it would no longer be applicable (31:29). But it was a pernicious proverb, it implicitly questioned the divine justice because it intimated that it was just as unnatural for the Jews to suffer as it was for children to have blunted teeth because of the sour grapes eaten by their fathers. Hence when it reached the ears of Ezechiel, he felt compelled to refute it in as far as it was applied to the impending doom of the Jews.

It is frequently asserted[9] that in this refutation he repudiates the principle of social retribution contained in the texts which we have been discussing. An analysis of his discourse on the subject shows that this view needs modification (18:1-20). He bases his rejection of the proverb on a general principle of divine justice: in the matter of life or death every man, be he father or son, depends upon God, so that the fate of one does not involve the fate of the other (vv. 1-4). Hence he concludes that only the person who sins shall die. Then he illustrates this conclusion by three hypothetical cases: (1) a man has been true to all his obligations, he shall live (vv. 5-9); (2) the son of this man commits grievous sin, he shall die despite the rectitude of his father (vv. 10-13); (3) the son of this sinner and the grandson of (1) is faithful to all his duties, he shall live despite the inquity of his father (vv. 14-17). But the latter shall die (v. 18). It follows that the divine sentence of life or death does not depend upon the merits and demerits of a man's ancestors or descendants, but exclusively upon his moral state at the incidence of judgment (vv. 19, 20).

It is evident from this analysis that Ezechiel confines himself to but one aspect of retribution, the sentence of life or death to be passed on an individual at the coming of judgment. The life which he promises to the righteous under these conditions cannot be mere temporal existence, for he declares elsewhere that destruction will overtake the good and the bad indiscriminately (21: 3.4). Hence this life must be a higher form of existence consisting in the friendship of God not to be interrupted by bodily death. Similarly, the death to which he condemns the wicked cannot be merely the cessation of bodily life, for he states that some of the wicked will escape in the coming disaster (14: 22). Consequently, this death must be a spiritual one, resulting in permanent exclusion from divine fellowship. Since, therefore, Ezechiel confines the issue to spiritual life and death and teaches that these depend solely upon a man's individual merits, he cannot be said to have revised the ancient teaching on social retribution, which never considered this aspect of the question at all.

---

[9] Finkelstein, *The Pharisees* I, pp. 330-333; Robinson, *Record and Revelation*, p. 343.

The substance of Ezechiel's discourse on this subject is already contained in his vision which reveals the massacre of the citizens of Jerusalem in the coming siege by the Chaldeans (9:1-11). Before the divine executioners begin their gruesome task of slaughtering the inhabitants, the righteous are marked with the letter *Taw* to distinguish them from the idolaters and to warn the executioners that they are to be exempted from the massacre which is about to ensue (9:6). This cannot mean that only the righteous will escape physical death in the siege, for history shows that the innocent succumbed (Lam. 2:12) and that some of the wicked survived (Jer. 43:1 ff.), as Ezechiel himself had predicted (5:2,12). Accordingly, it must signify that the righteous will not suffer spiritual death in the threatened catastrophe, they will continue in the friendship of God even though they are overcome by physical death.

It cannot be said, then, that the earlier doctrine of social retribution was revoked by Ezechiel; in fact, if rightly understood, it does not stand in need of revocation or reformation. On one occasion our Lord's disciples asked Him about a man born blind: "Rabbi, who has sinned, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind?" Jesus answered: "Neither has this man sinned, nor his parents, but the works of God were to be made manifest in him" (Jn. 9:2). This answer shows that there may be other reasons for affliction beside personal and parental guilt, but it does not deny that these, also, may occasionally be the causes of misfortune.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

PETER DENIES HIS LORD

In considering the denials of Christ by Peter difficulties of no small moment arise; this is true not only in the narration of the facts of the denials, but also in the narration of the prediction and its relation to the actual denials. The scope of this article is to present the evangelical facts and to compare them: this is the first step towards a solution of the difficulties. It is hoped that this presentation and this comparison will prove helpful to the readers in understanding this significant event in the Passion of our Lord.

THE PREDICTION OF CHRIST

(Mt. 26:30-35; Mk. 14:26-31; Lk. 22:31-34; Jn. 13:36-38)

To understand Peter's denials we must briefly consider the prediction of these denials. After the institution of the Holy Eucharist on the evening before Christ's death, a hymn was recited, to indicate the end of the Paschal Supper. "Then Jesus said to them, 'You will all be scandalized this night because of me . . . .' But Peter answered and said to him, 'Even though all shall be scandalized because of thee, I will never be scandalized.' "[1] Our Lord's answer is given by all four Evangelists, although the immediate context differs in Luke and John.

Mt. 26:34	Mk. 14:30
Amen I say to thee this very night before a cock crows, thou wilt deny me thrice.	Amen I say to thee, *today,* this very night before a cock crows *twice* thou wilt deny me thrice.
Lk. 22:34	Jn. 13:38
I tell thee, Peter, a cock will not crow this day, *until* thou hast thrice denied *that thou knowest me.*	Amen, amen, I say to thee the cock will not crow before thou dost deny me thrice.

In each evangelist there is to be found the adjuration so familiar to readers of Christ's words; it is indicative of the solemnity of the words to follow. The variances are unimportant. The actual prediction may be divided into three sections:

---

[1] Mt. 26:31,33; Mk. 14:27,29. As noted above the immediate context of Luke and John differs. This caused St. Augustine to say that our Lord made a triple prediction of the denials, to correspond to the triple denial. This multiplication does not seem necessary; the fact narrated by the four evangelists is the same, the divergences are in minor details. As Lagrange remarks: "Ce sont des divergences de rédaction qu'il faut simplement constater" (*Ev. selon St. Mc.* 14:26, p. 358).

a) The time of the denial: "This very night." St. Mark has a very striking pleonasm, to use Fr. Lagrange's expression. "Today, this very night." St. John does not indicate the time. Today means Friday for the Jews, inasmuch as their day began with sunset; for us it means Thursday night or Friday morning. Anticipating for the moment the time of the cock crowing, we say the denials will take place Friday morning.

b) The crowing of the cock: This determines with greater accuracy the time of the denial. Peter will deny his Master 'before a cock crows,' that is, before many hours have passed, for the cock crows to herald the dawn. Inhabitants of Jerusalem are quoted to fix the precise time: between three and five-thirty A.M. during the latter part of March and the first part of April; this was the time of the prediction as the Passover occurred after the first full moon after the vernal equinox. With his usual flair for detail Mark notes that Christ speaks of the cock crowing *twice*.

c) The denials and their number: All evangelists agree in the fact of the denials and their number. Peter will deny his Master *thrice;* St. Luke adds that the denial will be concerned with friendship for Christ.

The sense of the prediction is: Peter will deny that he knows Christ three times before the cock crows twice.

THE DENIALS

(Mt. 26:69-75; Mk. 14:66-72; Lk. 22:54-62; Jn. 18:15-27)

1. The Context

The remote context of the denials is the same in the four Gospels. After the arrest of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemani the disciples fled, as their Master had predicted. Moreover the fact of Peter's nearness to Christ is indicated by the words: "But Peter was following him at a distance, even to the courtyard of the high priest, and he went in and sat with the attendants to see the end."[2] As we, however, study the immediate context we find divergences that assume such proportions as to overshadow the actual denials. Two differences claim our attention at the moment: the place and time of the denials.

A. THE PLACE: St. Matthew (26:58,69) indicates the "courtyard of the high priest," namely the courtyard of the house of

---

[2] **Mt. 26:58 and parallel passages.**

Caiphas. St. Mark (14:54,66) is still more explicit: "But Peter followed him at a distance, even to the courtyard of the high priest, and was sitting with the attendants at the fire and warming himself." "And while Peter was *below* in the courtyard..." St. Luke (22:54-55) does not add anything to the other two Synoptics. The place then is the open rectangular court where the servants gathered, awaiting the outcome of the trial of Christ; this court was in the center around which was built the house of Caiphas. St. John (18:15-16) tells us that a disciple known to the high priest introduced Peter "into the courtyard of the high priest." Was this the high priest, Caiphas, or was it Annas, father-in-law of Caiphas and former high priest? John indicates that our Lord was first brought before the latter, and in view of verse 24 of ch. 18 it would seem that the inquisition mentioned in vv. 19-23 took place before Annas; therefore the courtyard in question would be the courtyard of Annas.[3] However, in view of the Synoptics and in view also of v. 14, where Caiphas is given prominence, in view too of the fact that John calls Caiphas high priest (Jn. 18:13,24; cf. 11:49) it would seem that the courtyard in question is that of Caiphas. Hence the location of the denials is the open courtyard of the high priest, Caiphas.

B. THE TIME: The time has already been indicated by our Lord—today, this very night, before the cock crow. Yet the matter is not so easily settled, for although the term of the denials is gauged by the crowing of the cock, the interval between the inception and the term of the denials is undetermined. Let us examine the texts. The inception is not easily determined from the evangelists; St. John (18:15-18) seems to give the best indication; the portress is the first to accuse Peter of discipleship with Christ. It is natural to suppose that her question came shortly after she saw Peter enter the courtyard. Hence the time would be determined by the arrest of our Lord and the length of time it would take to bring him to the house of Annas (or Caiphas). Authorities disagree; it is probable however that the arrest took place between midnight and one o'clock. It would take an hour for the trip across Jerusalem to the house of Annas (or Caiphas) and for Peter to reach the interior of the courtyard. Two o'clock then would be near before the first denial, unless we wish to assume that the first cock-crowing as mentioned by Mark is that of the first appearance of dawn; then it would be close to three o'clock.

---

[3] There is the possibility that Annas and Caiphas lived together, or in the same house, but in different sections of the house. Then the courtyard in question would be that of the high priest, and there would be perfect agreement with the Synoptics.

The Evangelists give several indications of intervals of time between the denials. Between the first and second Luke notes that a "little while" intervened; between the second and third Matthew and Mark have the notation of Luke, "little while," whereas Luke has an entirely different remark: "And about an hour later."[4] Hence the interval of time may be loosely described as several hours. The term is indicated by the crowing of the cock, around five-thirty in the morning; Luke has another indication of the look of Christ, presuming that this was a sign of the termination of the trial. Broadly speaking then, we may say that the time of the denials was between two o'clock and five-thirty o'clock Friday morning.

2. The Actual Denials

(Mt. 26:69-75; Mk. 14:66-72; Lk. 22:55-62; Jn. 18:25-27)

Each Evangelist gives three denials on the part of Peter, but each one has his own variations.

PERSONS

Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
1. Maidservant	1. Maidservant	1. Maidservant	1. Portress
2. Another maid	2. Maidservant	2. Someone else	2. They (Bystanders)
3. Bystanders	3. Bystanders	3. Another	3. Servant of high-priest

QUESTIONS

Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
1. Direct assertion	1. Direct assertion	1. Direct assertion	1. Direct question
2. Indirect assertion	2. Indirect assertion	2. Direct assertion	2. Direct question
3. Direct assertion	3. Direct assertion	3. Indirect assertion	3. Direct question

RESPONSES

Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
1. Evasion	1. Evasion	1. Simple denial	1. Simple denial
2. Denial with oath	2. Again he denied	2. Simple denial	2. Simple denial
3. Vehement denial	3. Vehement denial	3. Evasion	3. Again he denied

---

[4] Lk. 22:58,59; Mt. 26:73; Mk. 14:70.

The Evangelists mention various persons who interrogate Peter; in some cases a definite person is indicated, in others an indefinite individual or individuals. In the first denial the four Gospels seem to agree: it is a maidservant, further classified by John as the portress. In the second denial Matthew speaks of another maid, Mark seems to indicate the same maid as in the first denial, Luke is indefinite, as it is "someone else" who accuses Peter, John uses the general term "they," meaning the servants and attendants who were standing around the fire with Peter. In the third denial Matthew and Mark agree: "bystanders" taunt the falling Apostle, Luke is once more indefinite, whereas John points out that a servant of the high priest asks Peter concerning his presence in the garden. There are, then, divergences in two of the three denials.

The questions or assertions show differences, likewise, both in content and in literary form. In the first denial the maidservant accuses Peter of being with Jesus of Nazareth, except in John where the portress asks Peter if he were not a disciple of this man; in form, Matthew and Mark have the accusation in direct language to Peter, in Luke the words are directed to the bystanders, in John the interrogative form is used. In the second denial the accusers insist that Peter was with Jesus of Nazareth, that he belonged to his group; in form, the first two Synoptics are indirect, Luke is direct, while John has the same question that he had in the first. In the third denial the bystanders assert the discipleship due to the language of Peter, John differing, however, in that there is question of Peter's presence in the garden at the time of the arrest of Jesus.

Peter's responses vary as do the persons and the questions. In the first denial according to Matthew and Mark he evades the issue, asserting that he does not know what the maidservant is saying; Luke and John record a simple denial. The second denial is made with an oath in Matthew, Mark asserts the fact indirectly, Luke and John again record a simple denial in direct language. Turning to the third, we find that in Matthew and Mark, Peter curses and swears that he knows not the man, in Luke we note that Peter evades the question, while in John we have the indirect remark that Peter again denied his Master.[5]

---

[5] For the sake of completeness it should be stated that there are slight differences in the exact location of each denial, although all agree with regard to the general place, namely the courtyard of the high priest.

Before attempting a solution of the difficulties, a few words may be said with regard to the accounts of the individual Evangelists. Matthew and Mark are in agreement except in one or two minor details; they do not spare Peter, is his responses show; their accounts are natural and spontaneous. Luke is more indefinite than the other two Synoptics, he seems more impersonal; John, on the other hand, is obviously sparing his companion; his account is simple, but not spontaneous. It is to be noted, however, that each narrator gives only three denials.

Whatever solution may be considered, it must take into account the prediction of the denials. Our Lord stated explicitly that Peter would deny him *thrice;* and it is noteworthy that the Evangelists record but three denials in each account, to show the exact fulfillment of the prophecy of Christ. With this in mind we come to a consideration of the systems of reconciling the divergences found in the accounts of the denials. a) One system multiplies the negations until their number corresponds with the various persons indicated by the four Evangelists. Thus some maintain that Peter denied his Master at least five times. How do the proponents of this system reconcile their multiplication with the declaration of our Lord that Peter would deny him thrice? They answer that our Lord must not be taken too literally, that He meant *at least* three times. b) Another system maintains that despite the variations in the accounts of the denials there is a substantial concordance. Peter *formally* denied his Master three times, although *orally* he denied Him a number of times; in each formal denial there probably were several oral denials. In this system the triple denial predicted by our Lord is understood in the formal sense.[6] This latter system seems to have more probability than the other; certainly it explains the divergences in a very natural way.

The scene may be reconstructed in this fashion. After the arrest of Christ Peter fled with the other Apostles, but soon, becoming ashamed of himself, follows at a distance. Another disciple, very likely John, also followed and by reason of an unexplained connection with the high priest was permitted to enter the courtyard of Caiphas. Peter stands without and is permitted to enter at the request of the other disciple. As he enters the portress notes him very carefully, and a short time later, after gazing at him intently as he warms himself at the fire, accuses him of being a disciple of Jesus of Galilee; Peter evades the question by pretending that he does not know what she is saying. She insists and remarks to the assembled ministers that Peter is an adherent of Christ; Peter denies. The fallen Apostle senses the hostile atmosphere and leaves the warmth of the fire to retire into the vestibule, where he would not be disturbed, yet would be near enough to see the outcome of the trial. The cock crows for the first time, but Peter is too preoccupied to notice the warning. But Peter was not long in his security; another maid noticed him, and remarked to those around the gateway that Peter was with Jesus of Nazareth. Peter with an oath denied that he knew the man; whereupon he returns to the fire. The portress once more accosts him and accuses him to the crowd as a disciple of Christ; another takes up the cue, and finally many of those around the fire taunt him with the same accusation. Peter responds to one and then to another, and finally to all; he denies any association with Christ. After an hour or so another bystander resumes the attack on Peter; the language of the Apostle is that of a native Galilean, Christ is from Galilee, so it is obvious that Peter belongs to the disciples of Christ. Peter disclaims any acquaintanceship, but once more the bystanders *en masse* accuse him; finally a servant of the high priest, a relative of Malchus, whose ear Peter had cut off in the garden, asked Peter if he (the servant) did not see him in the garden. This was too much for Peter; he began to curse and to swear that he knew not Jesus.

---

[6] Cajetan holds the first opinion; Lagrange, Fillion, etc., the second.

As Peter vehemently denied any knowledge of Christ, the cock crowed the second time. The sound smote Peter's ears, and almost involuntarily he looked up, only to encounter the eyes of His Master upon him. It is difficult to ascertain the position of Jesus at this moment. We have already stated that the denials ended around five-thirty in the morning, assuming that the crow of the cock was the herald of the morning. In that case it is possible that our Lord was being led forth for the early morning trial as indicated by Luke (22:66): "And as soon as day broke, the elders of the people and the chief priests and Scribes gathered together; and they led him away into their Sanhedrin . . ." It is barely possible that he was being led forth to Pilate; however the time—five-thirty—seems to preclude this.

The crow of the cock and the look of our Lord brought back to Peter's memory the prediction of the evening before. "And

Peter went out and wept bitterly." In those few words the repentance of Peter is recorded. It was a repentance of life, not of death as in the case of Judas.

3. Conclusions

A. There are several variations in the accounts of the prediction; substantially however the Evangelists are in accord: Peter will deny his Master thrice before the cock crows (twice adds Mark); it will be this very night.

B. The remote context is identical in the four accounts. The proximate context differs in minor details—in the determination of the precise time and place of the denials. The time however may be stated as between two and five-thirty Friday morning. The place is the courtyard of the high priest, Caiphas.

C. The denials are listed as three by each Evangelist, an indication of the fulfillment of the prediction of Christ; however, the Evangelists differ *inter se* with regard to persons, questions, and answers. Two systems attempt to reconcile the divergences: a) multiplication of the denials; b) substantial concordance of the Evangelists—three formal denials with several oral denials in each formal denial.

GILMORE H. GUYOT, C.M.

Kenrick Seminary
St. Louis, Missouri

NOTES ON THE STEM *d-b-r*

A Semasiological Study

Apart from the fascination which it exercises upon the student, semasiological research proves a most valuable aid towards the clear and comprehensive understanding of ancient languages. Its usefulness in the study of the sacred text of the Holy Bible in particular, should be adequately appreciated. For it is one thing to accept the content and meanings of words as they are handed down through fairly reliable translations and concurrent expositions; it is quite another thing to reach back into the earliest origins of those same word elements and to follow their gradual development through the drudgery and the vicissitudes of the lives and struggles of the people that used them daily. After all, these linguistic remains are the oldest physical elements that we possess of any nation, and these remains reveal to us what transpired in their souls. Hence it is that this branch of philology has the capacity of affording us a wealth of both archaeological and psychological material of past generations. For in the search-light of semasiological analysis the words of ancient texts cease to be merely bearers of well-defined ideas or truths; they become living beings, pulsating with the life of ancient peoples, revealing their inmost sensations, and reflecting, in a measure at least, the contacts with the world in which they lived and the environment which surrounded them. Last, but not least, the theologian is not infrequently surprised to find that even a "veritas revelata" may gain unsuspected color and support from this source.

It is consistent with the nature and growth of language that meanings attached to physical objects or actions, provided these are within the sphere of a primitive mode of life, are usually of a prior type than the meanings that carry moral or philosophical, religious or cultural implications. For, unless "an angel from heaven should preach a gospel" (Gal. 1:8), human language usually follows the course from a simple, immediate, and sensible to a more elevated usage. This is borne out by the old philosophical axiom: "Nihil in intellectu quod prius non fuerit in sensu." Wherefore, any meaning which involves reflection, deliberation, speculation, or emotion, or an application to a new object, thought or idea, even within the ambitus of an everyday, normal mode of life, has on it the stamp of a secondary or derived meaning. And here it may be remarked in passing that this one characteristic imparts to the Old Testament stories a stamp of originality and primitiveness which we vainly seek in Assyrian, Babylonian, and Egyptian mythologies.

The facts reveal that the Semitic heritage generally is embedded in those meanings of words which have the nomadic life of the desert as their background. It will be seen, in fact, that in words of common and simple usage, the Arabic Dictionary holds the key to the solution of most of the etymological and semasiological problems in Semitic Language study. Which means, not that Arabic is the oldest Semitic tongue, but that the Arabic language has best preserved both the physical form and the signification of Semitic words in their original purity. This is due, no doubt, to the stability and seclusiveness of desert life.

In the study of the word stem *d-b-r*, which has played a most varied and at times wayward role in the various Semitic tongues, the matter that concerns us chiefly is to determine the mental pictures which were instrumental in producing the numerous ramifications of its meanings and nuances. And when a picture, set together from the entire range of associations, is fairly well in hand, there is the still more delicate task of ascertaining upon what particular feature the related process of apperception was focused in the creation of new meanings and usages.[1] At all events, once we have established the basic idea which was carried by the primitive stem, it will be comparatively easy to trace its various derivatives.

It would be a waste of time to theorize on the possible change from a pre-historic monosyllabic root to the tri-radical stem *d-b-r*.[2] It would be equally precarious to discuss the priority of nominal and verbal forms.[3] Even the assumption of a basic meaning in what may be termed as "Ursemitisch" is apt to lead us astray. However, if a simple, in particular a physical designation or a group of such related designations, definitely attached to simple nominal or verbal forms, be found to exist in several of the languages or language groups, we may be certain of having come close to the basic meaning.

---

[1] Cf. W. Wundt, *Voelkerpsychologie: Die Sprache*, II, pp. 467 ff., passim; also T. Plassmann, *The Signification of Berākā*, pp. 19 ff.

[2] C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergl. Gramm. der sem. Sprachen*, I, pp. 285-286.

[3] *Id.*, p. 330.

There is evidence that the present stem was in common use before the eastern Semitic group (Assyro-Babylonian) separated from the western, and before in this western group the northern languages (Canaanitic and Aramaic) were separated from the southern (Arabic and Abyssinian).[4] In the light of this evidence there has been much discussion concerning the basic meaning of *d-b-r*. Some decades ago this matter was still considered dubious.[5] More recently, Gesenius Buhl[6] declares confidently that the original meaning is to be found in Arabic "to be behind" (hinten sein) and Aramaic "to drive forward, to lead" (vorwärts treiben, führen). Among all the theories advanced, this one seems nearest the solution. The question to solve is, which of the two claims priority, or which is the ground meaning.[7]

The semasiological process of the stem *d-b-r* shows the following four distinct stages of development:

1. "Being or moving behind something; the back"; 2. "Driving; a leader"; 3. "Directing; management"; 4. "Speaking; word." The first category adheres closely to the physical concept, even in its figurative applications. Our assumption that it is

---

[4] Cf. *id.*, pp. 6 ff.

[5] E. Robinson, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, s.v.*

[6] W. Gesenius, *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterbuch* (17th ed., by Buhl), *s.v.*

[7] Owing to the lack of adequate equipment the transliteration of Semitic terms will be found to be defective. To facilitate consultation, we append herewith a list of such lexicographical works as were available for this article: Cooke, G., *Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1903); Delitzsch, Friedr., *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (1896); Muss-Arnold, W., *A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language* (Berlin, 1905); Bezold, C., *Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar* (Heidelberg 1926); Brun, J., *Dictionarium Syriaco-Latinum* (Beirut, 1895); Smith, Payne R., *Thesaurus Syriacus* (Oxford, 1879); Id. *A Compendious Syriac Lexicon* (Oxford, 1903); Maclean, A. J., *Dictionary of Vernacular Syriac* (Cambridge, 1901); Buxtorfius, J., *Lexicon Chaldaicum Talmudicum et Rabbinicum* (Leipzig, 1875); Dalman, G., *Aramaeisch-Neuhebr. Handwörterbuch* (Goettingen, 1938); Jastrow, M., *Dictionary of the Targumim*, etc., (Philadelphia, 1903); Levy, Rabb. J., *Caldäisches Wörterbuch ueb. d. Targumin,* (Leipzig, 1881); Drach, P. L. B., *Catholicum Lexicon Hebr. & Chald.* (Paris, 1863); Gesenius-Buhl, *Hebr. u. Aramaeisches Handwörterbuch ueber d. Alte Testament* (17th ed., Leipzig, 1921); E. Robinson, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Boston, 1907); Hava, J. G., *Arabic-English Dictionary* (Beirut, 1899); Kazimirski, A. de Bieb., *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français* (Paris, 1860); Lane, E. W., *Arabic-English Lexicon* (London, 1863-93); Dillmann, C. F. A., *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae* (incl. dialect of Tigre; Leipzig 1865); Guidi, I., *Vocabolario Amarico-Italiano* (Roma, 1901).

the ground-meaning, is evidenced by the simple, unmodified forms of this category; by their distinctly primitive usages; and by the fact that the crystallization happened at a primitive date in the Arabic, Abyssinian, and Aramaic groups. Also the Canaanitic group shows survivals, and probably the Assyro-Babylonian, although its possible absence in this quarter would constitute no contrary "argumentum ex silentio," in view of our present meager lexicographical data. The second category, being more restricted, enters the pastoral and agricultural fields in the Aramaic, Arabic, and Assyro-Babylonian groups. The third rises to a higher social level and is principally employed in social and administrative parlance in Aramaic dialects and Hebrew. The fourth category is confined to cultural and religious levels, chiefly in Hebrew and Western Aramaic. The entire process offers an illustration of the cultural history of the Semites and, in general, bears out the normal sequence: "Ab imperfecto ad perfectum."

THE FIRST STAGE

In Arabic a wide range of meanings is covered by the nominal forms *dabr* "location, quarter behind a thing" (Lane) and *dubur* "the back; pars posterior"; "latter part; angle of a house; end of a prayer, of a month, of an affair" (Hava), and numerous other nominal applications. That we are dealing here with the ground-meaning, viz., "back of man, animal or any object," is evident also from the Ethiopic usages *tadabara* "to lie on one's back"; *dabarbîr* "supine,"[8] also used in the sense of "back (support) of a seat," and from Aramaic בדבור "back, backward" (Buxtorf). Bezold finds extensions of this meaning in the Assyro-Bab. group, e.g., I 2 "to keep at a distance"; II 1 "to turn around" (said of a demon).

The Arabic verbal form *dabara* has an equally extensive range of meanings, viz., "to be or follow behind his back," and in a broader sense "to follow another with respect to place and time (also station or rank); to succeed another" (Lane). The above, and the signification "to turn back" (Hava); "to sever oneself from another; retreat; treat him with enmity" take on numerous nuances in the 3rd, 4th, 6th and 10th forms. Also Syriac *debar* "to journey, wander" belongs here.

To turn one's back and stay behind in all human affairs, and especially in battle, connotes weakness, adversity, defeat. Hence,

---

[8] Dillmann, *Chrestomatia Aeth.*, p. 264.

dabara "perdition befell him; he became an old man" (Lane); *dubur* "a turn of evil fortune; a turn to be vanquished; defeat" (Lane); *dabrat* "defeat; consequence; adversity;" *dabâr* "loss, ruin" (Hava). Also the 4th verbal or causative form expresses adversity of fortune: "An affair goes backward to a bad state; declines," etc. (Lane). From this there is only a short step to the meaning "to die" (4th form) and *dabr* "death"; also Syriac *debarta,* "death."

Wherever there is adversity, oriental superstition is certain to play its part. This is true of significations like "the West; westerly wind; western part of the sky." "The West is regarded as the hinder quarter" (Lane), and for that reason it connotes bad luck. Similarly Wednesday and "travelling on Wednesday" are designated by forms of this stem because "it is a day of ill luck" (Lane).

In the Abyssinian group emphasis was placed on the two significations "back" and "end" (terminus). In Amharic the notion of bulkiness, roundness, probably as referred to the back, has developed the forms *dabbári* "grown fat" (said of a boy) and *adábari* "to cause to grow fat." The shape of a mountain now enters the picture (cf. "Mons pinguis"). Dillmann states correctly: "ab eminendo dictum videtur" (cf. German "Bergsrücken"). Hence *dabĕr* (Geez) has come to be the common name for "mountain" (Gen. 22:14; Ex. 19:2 ff.; Mt. 4:8; etc.) and "mountainous region" (Deut. 33:2; Jos. 17:16; etc.). It is frequently transferred to "cities" or "monasteries," in as much as they are located on mountains; or it is used as the proper name for specific mountains, e.g., Mt. Thabor, Mt. Olivet. In the Tigre dialect *Debretabòr* is the "Feast of the Transfiguration."

The idea "end" implies the thought of "limit, boundary" (cp. "ends of the earth"). In this sense it occurs frequently in the Ethiopic Bible (Gen. 10:19; 47:2; etc). In Amharic and Tigre this designation applies either to sacred things, as *dabbari* "to mark off sacred territory" (cp. Arabic *dabr* "piece of land separated"), hence *dabĕr* "shrine"; or to material usages. Here it has the meaning either of "limiting, checking," f.i., *asdabarí* "to cause to limit" and *dabér* "a tamed bull"; or of "lengthening, prolonging," f.i., *dabere* "to live long; to become rich" (Tigre). Length of days, extension of limits (i.e. possessions), and expansion in body and property are easily associated. Kazmirski hits on the true derivation of intr. Arabic *dabira*: "être riche, avoir des biens, troupeaux—avoir quelque chose derrière soi." Hence *dibr* "masse d'eau; grand richesse," and *dabr* "biens, richesse, utilité, profit"; also "sommeil" (since a sound sleep is the greatest blessing of all). Lane explains *dabr* "wealth" as "many camels such as cannot be computed."

Now a word on Hebrew דביר (*debîr*), in its technical designation, "the holy of holies", i.e., the rear, innermost room or hall of the temple, in which was placed the Ark of the Covenant (Cf. 1 Kgs. 6:5,16,19-23; 7:49; 8:6,8; 2 Par. 3:16; 4:20; 5:7,9; Ps. 28:2). The use of this term in the Peshitto and other Semitic Versions (cf. however Ethiopic *dabir* "choir," in modern churches), may be accounted for as a transliteration and lacks, therefore, philological significance. The controversy is old. Even today some trace *debîr* to *dābār* "Word" (of God) spoken to the chief priest, and *dibber* "He (the Lord) spoke";[9] others trace it to the physical ground-meaning of the stem.[10] The LXX and other Greek Versions either transliterate the term (*Dabeir*) or render it χρηματιστήριον (Aqu. and Symm.). The Vulgate renders almost consistently "oraculum" which, apart from the etymological implication, answers the functional purpose of this sacred place.

In reality, however, there is little doubt that it was the location rather than the function which gave the name to this room. The derivation of a *qetîl* form from Piel *"dibber"* seems morphologically out of the question;[11] nor is a derivation from *dābār* likely. Again, the designation of *hêkal,* as the "palatial hall," seems to indicate that the different apartments of the temple were named after their physical structure or position. In fact, דביר הבית (1 Kgs. 8:6) can only mean "the rear (or innermost) part of the house." Also אל־דביר קדשך (Ps. 28:2) carries the obvious meaning "to the interior of thy sanctuary." The Vulgate reads "ad templum sanctum tuum." Nor should we overlook the fact that *debîr* was frequently applied to towns or localities, in which cases the usage was clearly determined by geographical direction, in the sense of "the town in the rear; towards the west" (cf. Jos. 10:3; etc).

---

[9] S. Lee, *Lexicon, Hebrew, Chaldee* and *English* (London, 1840), *s.v.*

[10] Prichard in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible,* III, p. 629, Note; ib. Davies, IV pp. 697 ff.; See *Hebr. and Engl. Lexicon* (ed. Robinson), *s.v.*

[11] Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.,* p. 356.

All of which leads us to conclude that the primitive meaning of the stem was still in active use when the holy of holies was installed and designated as the "hall in the rear," "the interior" of the temple. Perhaps there is here a reminiscence of the "west-end" of desert days (cf. Arabic above. See Num. 3:38; 10:5). At all events, the designation goes back to the basic idea contained in Arabic *dabr* "location, quarter behind" and in the Amharic forms *dabir,* "church, shrine." Amharic *dabbari* "to mark off the sacred precincts" (of a church) suggests that originally the farmost part was segregated and marked off as the innermost, consecrated room of a sanctuary (cp. also Coptic *tabir* "inner room").[12]

THE SECOND STAGE

From its original general meaning the stem *d-b-r* passed into the more specific meaning of "driving" (animals) in the pastoral and agricultural environment among the northern Semites. As applied to the shepherd behind his flock or the driver behind his beast of burden it took on definitely transitive force.

In Syriac (2 Kgs. 4:24, etc.) and all other Aramaic dialects *debar* is the common term for "driving to pasture," "driving animals" (wagon) or "ploughing" in the simple Peal forms, and, with the added notion of intensity, in the Pael forms. Arabic *dabara* and Assyrian *dabāru* (*dapāru*) usually imply added force: "To drive away; to chase" (cp. Ass. Piel *duppuru* and Amarna *dubburu* in the same sense). From the act of driving to pasture the place of pasture was named. Numerous nominal and participial formations resulted, e.g., *debarâ, dabrâ, madebarâ, madebar* (Syriac), *daberâ* (Jew-Aramaic), *dabr* (Arabic: Kazmirski), *mudbaru, muddbiru, dibiru* (Assyr.: Delitzsch)—with such meanings as "pasture; field; desert land; island under water; distant country; wilderness," etc. The Hebrew forms are מדבר and דבר (*dober*) "pasture" (Mich. 2:13; Isa. 6:17). *Doberôt* "floats" (1 Kgs. 5:23) is explained (cp. English "driving-drift") by Jew.-Aramaic *daborâ* "drift, flow, current" (Jastrow); Syr. *debar* "to steer a ship; row."

From this usage the Syrians and western Aramaeans have coined a variety of significations pertaining to everyday life, e.g., "to lead; lead away, seize," usually by force (e.g. the devil; captor, oppressor); "to take away" (e.g. a wife; substance). Naturally Aramaic Pael has exploited this meaning in numerous significations and nuances. Syriac and W. Aramaic *debarṫâ* "booty" is hardly to be understood as "things left behind," but rather as "prey taken from enemy countries" (Payne Smith; cf. Num. 31:11 etc. Cp. Arab. *dabar* "to take away"). Nominal forms in all Aramaic dialects convey the idea of "leadership," which, however, reaches into the third category.

---

[12] See Gesenius-Buhl, *op. cit., s.v.*

The picture before us has also developed the notion of "strength, power", e.g. Neo-Syriac *dabir* "to strengthen (with bolts)"; Assyr. *dabru*, adj. "strong, mighty" (Muss-Arnold. Cp. *dabra* "beam" in Jew.-Aramaic).

At a very early date the stem *d-b-r* was used to denote insects of the order of Hymenoptera, specifically bees, wasps, hornets. The nominal forms of this designation, in the Arabic and Aramaic groups and in Hebrew, apply to individual insects, but the collective use ("swarm") appears to be more common.

Certain Arabic authorities trace this application to such insects because they have "stings in their hinder parts" (Ṣ M Ḳ, Lane). However, this rather convenient conjecture fails to account for such variations as Arabic *dibr* "locusts" and Neo-Syriac *dibûrâ* (*dibûrtâ*) "horsefly, gadfly" (Maclean), which have biting mouth parts. Other authors point out the onomatopoeic character of an imaginary primitive *d-b* (cp. *dob* "bear—growler") to which they trace such stems as *d-b-r*, *z-b-r*, and *z-m-r*, all denoting a humming sound.[13] Under this assumption the early Semites would have designated the bee or hornet originally as "the hummer" in the same manner as we name the bumble-bee or the drone. Surely the custom, quite prevalent in the Orient, of drivers and shepherds continuously humming or emitting monotonous sounds while urging on their flocks or beasts or even workmen, lends force and color to this opinion. In fact, it would very neatly explain the more developed Hebrew signification of "speaking, commanding." However, as will be shown presently, this element is only a part picture of the associations which lead to the full crystallization of both significations, "bee" and "speech."

[13] Halévy, *Revue Sémit.*, XVIII, p. 498; Haupt, *Journal American Orient. Society*, XXXII, p. 19; Gerber, *Die hebr. Verba denominativa*, p. 230, and others quoted by Gesenius-Buhl, *Handwörterbuch*, *s.v.*

Arabic *dabr* "swarm of bees, hornets, young locusts" (Hava) may be classified as a simple *nomen actionis*[14] while Syriac *debbûrâ* "wasp" and *debbûrtâ* "wasp, bee," with a doubled middle radical[15] denote intensive action. Jewish Aramaic *debborîtâ* and *dabberîtâ* (Dalman) also reveal intensive force. Other Aramaic variants are *dabrâ* and *debartâ*.

In all these instances, as well as in the ancient Hebrew word דבורה, the feminine form functions both as a collective and as a *nomen unitatis.*[16] In the plural this Hebrew word automatically turns masculine,[17] which shows that the males or drones of the species were credited with the driving impact exerted by the entire swarm.

This factor of the driving power of a swarm undoubtedly played a part in the primitive designation of the term. This means that the early Semite used the term *d-b-r* to denote a swarm of bees or similar insects because of the buzzing, swarming, driving action it exercised upon its object.[18] The dreadful threat of such onrushing swarms still lingers in early Oriental literature. An army chases (רדף) its foes "as bees do" (Deut. 1:44) ; [19] it "surrounds them like bees" (Ps. 118:12; Vulg. 117: 12) ; hornets are sent to their destruction (Deut. 7:20; Ex. 23: 28; Jos. 24:12). The Lord, in His wrath, is said to gather the bees ("whistle to them") to harass His people (Isa. 7:18). A cursory glance at ancient Greek poetry shows that the dreaded threat of bee swarms was not confined to Palestine. Thus Homer dwells graphically on this abhorrent type of the plague of the "insolent bee," as he puts it.[20] With this idea in mind Drach ventures to explain the Aramaic form *debor* "bee, wasp" (Isa. 7:8) in the sense of "examen, quasi exagimen ab exagendo." The Targum uses the expression "mighty (תקיפין) as the bees" (Isa. 7:18; Levy). The closeness of these ideas to the stem *d-b-r* is warranted by the Assyrian adjective *dabru* "strong, mighty" (Delitzsch) which occurs in the expression "whirling days" or

---

[14] Cf. Wright, *Arabic Grammar,* I, 112.

[15] Noeldeke, *Syrische Grammatik,* p. 72.

[16] Cf. Gesenius-Kautsch, *Hebr. Grammatik,* No. 122 p. ff.

[17] Gesenius-Kautsch, *op. cit.,* No. 122 t; Brockelmann, *op. cit.,* I p. 445.

[18] Cf. Schegg, *Biblische Archaeologie* (1887), p. 104.

[19] An interesting side-light is furnished by the use of *dabr* "Blind Man's Buff" in Mod. Arabic (Hava).

[20] Cf. Iliad, II 85 ff.; 469 ff.; XII 167 ff. See Wuensche, *Die Bildersprache des Alten Testamentes* (Leipzig 1906), pp. 96-97.

"mighty storms" (Muss-Arnold). Lastly, Levy explains *dabbaryatâ* as "swarms or herds of bees, led on by their shepherd or queen bee."

This brings us to the ancient Song of Deborah, Judg. 5:1-31. Both the name and character of this heroine and the poetic inspiration of her song are best understood and appreciated in the present setting. Urged on by Deborah, who holds court under the Deborah Oak on Mt. Thabor, the tribes of Israel gather about her, as the bees are wont to swarm around their queen when she prepares for her flight. From the first line (5:1 בפרע פרעות "When the leaders took the lead . . . ") to the end (mark especially vv. 4,5) the words and imagery reveal that the picture of a buzzing swarm of bees, gathering to take off, was in the poet's mind. In v. 7 the queen bee, the mother and leader, asserts herself: שקמתי אם בישראל — "I arose, a mother in Israel." (cf. Deut. 22:6,7). Rightly she calls herself דבורה as the leader or the most conspicuous in her class.[21] In v. 12 the queen arouses herself. The exclamation עורי עורי "Arise, arise," carries realistic effect ("Shoo! shoo!" cp. Deut. 32:11). However, the recurrence of the stem *d-b-r in* דברי־שיר *after* דבורה should be explained as a case of paronomasia.[22]

The above brings before us another form which undoubtedly goes way back to Semitic antiquity, viz., Hebrew *deber* "pest, pestilence." In Arabic we find *dabr* in the sense of "sore, gall (of camels); ulcered beast" (Hava); "galls, sores on the back" (Lane), in various formations. The same usage survives in Assyrian *dibiri* and Maltese *dabra.*[23] It is significant that Aramaic should use the same form *debartâ* for "bee" and "pestilence."

We believe that the notion of pest or plague attached itself in the same manner to the stem *d-b-r* as the swarm of onrushing bees. Aside from those instances where the term is used of the plague of beasts (Ex. 9:3; Jer. 21:6), it is used consistently in the same breath with the other great disasters: war (the sword) and hunger. Pestilence is conceived as "falling upon the people" (*paga'*, Ex. 5:3); as "cleaving to the people" (*dabaq*, Deut. 28:21); as "being sent into their midst" (Lev. 26:25); or as "the Lord sending it among them" (2 Sam. 24:13,14; Hab. 3:5). All of which allows us to infer that "pest" and similar maladies (in

---

[21] Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 419.

[22] I. Cazsanowicz, *Paronomasia in the Old Testament*, p. 52.

[23] Gesenius-Buhl, *op. cit.*, *s.v.*

Arabic) were originally designated as "driving evil forces settling on the back" (of man or beast). Compare also Assyr. *Dibbara* "pest god."[24]

The above may throw some light on two disputed texts in Hebrew. In Psalm 91:3 (Vulg. 90:3) LXX, Symm., Syriac read *midbar*. Hence the Vulgate translates "a verbo aspero." It would seem that the reading *midbeber hawwot* "from the pest of destruction" agrees better with the previous phrase "hidden snare." However, the more interesting case is Os. 13:14, which St. Paul renders: "Ubi est mors victoria tua? Ubi est mors stimulus tuus?" (1 Cor. 15:55). Regardless of the original reading, we should observe that the terms *deber* "pest" and *qeṭeb* (stimulus) "destruction, plague" have synonymic meanings (cf. Ps. 91:6; Vulg. 90:6: "a negotio perambulante in tenebris, ab incursu, et daemonio meridiano"). Hence the renderings "pestis" and "pernicies" have much in their favor. At all events, the greater the havoc wrought by the pestilence (*deber*), the greater would be the consequent victory. Hence, no matter what reading St. Paul followed, his triumphant claim of victory by the Savior over death is well sustained even by the reading of *deber* "pestilence (destruction)."[25]

THIRD STAGE

There is only a short step from the meaning of "driving" to that of "directing." In Arabic and Aramaic the transition is still sensed. The intensive or second conjugation in Arabic denotes "to consider, forecast issues, results of an affair." This meaning conveys the picture of the driver or shepherd who looks ahead of his plough or flock. Hence, "to devise, plan, plot a thing; to manage, conduct, order, regulate an affair; to act with policy, forethought," etc. (Lane). Thus *mudabbir* is "one who manages, conducts, orders, or regulates."

In the Aramaic languages this meaning has been most prolific. In Syriac the idea of "leading away forcefully; oppressing," as applied to the physical life (cf. Lev. 19:13 ff.), carried the notion of a certain amount of discipline, rigor, and austerity over to administrative, moral, and ascetical functions. *Dabûrâ, meda-*

---

[24] Cf. Robinson, *op. cit., s.v.*

[25] Cf. *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae, V.T.* Pars III 1, *Prophetae Minores*, pp. 173 ff.; Orelli, *Die zwölf. klein. Propheten* (Strack-Zöckler, *Kurzgef. Kommentar*), p. 38.

branâ occur in the sense of "leader" (1 Kgs. 9:16ff.); the latter also as "judge, tutor, rector, abbot, etc." *Dûbarâ* signifies "manner, rule of life; government; ascetical norm and practice." *Medabranûtâ* means "government, rule, moral conduct, administration," and specifically "prefecture." It has even entered the theological field in the sense of "Oeconomia Verbi Incarnati."

Pael, Ethpeal and Ethpael forms diversify this meaning in sundry ways both in East and West Aramaic. Compare Syriac Pael "to administer" (1 Sam. 12:14); *medabberâ* "governor;" *dabberâ* "administration" (both W. Aram.). Self-government asserts itself among these meanings, e.g. "to converse in fear" (Syr. Ethp. 1 Pet. 1:17 ff.); "to conduct oneself" (Jastrow); Neo-Syr. *daber* "to educate." The expression ודבר עמרה "he led his life" in a Palmyrene inscription (Cooke, p. 278) proves that this usage was both ancient and wide-spread.

In the light of the above, Hebrew *dābār* "matter, affair" is not a secondary meaning of the same form in the sense of "word," but is prior to it both in time and development. Hence the order in which our dictionaries usually place its various applications should be readjusted. The basic concept occurs in expressions like כל־הדברים אשׁר עשׂה (Gen. 24:66). Proceeding from the notion of "looking ahead, planning, ordering" the following meanings have developed: 1) "reason, cause" (in the mind of the agent: 1 Kgs. 9:15, etc.); 2) "way, manner" (as planned: Deut. 15:2, etc.); 3) "business, occupation, task" (as ordered: 1 Sam. 21:4; 4) "acts, deeds" (executed to order: 1 Kgs. 11:41, etc.); 5) "cause, case" (for judicial investigation: Ex. 18:16, etc.); 6) "matter, affair" (as described: 1 Kgs. 15:5, etc.); 7) "events, things" (usually with the thought of Divine Providence: Gen. 15:1, etc.); 8) "something, anything" (indefinite: Gen. 22:16, etc.). In the last instance the term takes on a very generic and usually a euphemistic sense to cover up an unmentionable matter (Cf. Deut. 23:15; 24:1). In West-Aramaic (e.g. דבר אחר) it may refer to anything "not to be named" (idolatry, swine, leprosy, etc.: Jastrow).

FOURTH STAGE

There is no trace of the significations "to speak; word" in the Arabic, Abyssinian, and Assyrian groups. The second form in Arabic is used in the sense of "relating a tradition, story or narrative, having heard it from another" (Lane). The qualification places this usage with the first category, "turning back." The Aramaic group leans entirely on biblical Hebrew in the use of this meaning, with the exception of a few adapted expressions like *dibbûr* "sermo articulatus" (Buxtorf), *dabberâ* "word of God" (Levy), *dabbaranît* "talkative (Jastrow) and Niph. "to converse" (Dalman).

The expression קל דברי in an ancient Maltese inscription (Cooke) would indicate that the usage was widely spread in the Canaanitic group. The transition from "leading, directing" to "speaking" is obvious, for in the Orient every leader speaks, and speaks with emphasis. Of him it may be said at every turn: "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks" (Mt. 12:34). In a special manner, however, is this usage linked up with the worship of God among the Hebrews. As the "word of God," the Old Testament uses the term *dābār* as many as 394 times.[26] In His hands, as the Creator and Conserver of the universe and the supreme Lord and Director of all destiny, the term *dābār* takes on the full meaning of what was described above, viz., "the plan, government, order" and, proceeding from His mouth, through patriarch, prophet, king, or leader, the order becomes "a divine utterance; a spoken command; the decree or counsel of God." It is well to point out that the term occurs very rarely in the ordinary sense of "word, words" (see dictionaries). If not applied to God's word directly, it is always used in a specific sense, such as "message, counsel, promise, charge, decision, theme, saying, utterance", or, when applied to human beings, it usually carries with it a qualifying noun or adjective, e.g. נבון דבר "discreet in speech" (1 Sam. 16:18).

There is no need of associating the Piel *dibber* "to speak" with any Arabic usage. Rather it appears that it is the intensive action or application of what the noun conveys, viz., "to bring out, convey, communicate a *dābār*," i.e., an utterance, order, command. Leaving aside the few instances of what seems to be an adapted usage in Qal and Niphal, we observe that usually the Piel is followed by לאמר, which indicates that *dibber* did not, at least not originally, convey the meaning of "speaking." This assumption is strengthened by the frequent use of prepositions like את (with), ב (instrument, means) or על (concerning, upon) before the verb. However, this point requires more detailed investigation.

---

[26] Cf. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon* (ed. Robinson), s.v.

SURVEY

Life	*d-b-r*	Meaning
Physical-material	I	"back-behind"
Pastoral-agricultural	II	"drive-force"
Social-administrative	III	"direct-govern"
Cultural-religious	IV	"ordain-speak"

THOMAS PLASSMANN, O.F.M.

St. Bonaventure Seminary
St. Bonaventure, New York

THE PRAYER OF CHRIST FOR SAINT PETER

Holy Week brings to the foreground the details of our Savior's last week on earth. While these are known in general to every Catholic, still some are crowded out by others. Among the items that very often go unnoticed is Christ's reference during the Last Supper that he had prayed for St. Peter: "And the Lord said, 'Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith may not fail; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren' " (Lk. 22:31,32).

This allusion by the Savior to his prayer for St. Peter is proper to St. Luke's Gospel, where it is found in the Lord's discourse at the Last Supper. This is not strange, for St. Matthew (16:16 f.) and St. John (21:15 ff.), also, have their own peculiar promise made to Peter by our Lord; each omits what the other has. St. Mark, however, mentions none of these events, for, it is unlikely that Peter himself referred to them in his discourses, which were St. Mark's main sources.

The occasion and time of the prayer are not made known. But it seems certain that Christ did not offer this special prayer for the Prince of the Apostles at the Last Supper, nor immediately before it. Our Lord simply says, "I have prayed for thee," referring evidently to a prayer spoken sometime in the past. According to some exegetes,[1] our Savior made this prayer for Peter shortly after the first multiplication of the loaves: "And when he had dismissed the crowd, he went up the mountain by himself to pray" (Mt. 14:23; cf. Mk. 6:46; Lk. 9:18). But the matter is uncertain. In this connection, it is interesting to note with Knabenbauer[2] and others the similarity between Christ's prayer for Peter and Peter's confession of his divinity (Mt. 16:17-19). That such a similarity exists between the two is evident from the following considerations: first, Satan's desire to destroy the Church, expressed in the words, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," parallel our Lord's words to Peter, "Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat"; secondly, the perpetual vigilance of God apparent in the words, "and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," forms a parallel with our Savior's petition, "but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail"; thirdly, in the words, "thou art Peter and upon this rock I will built my Church," we see how closely they parallel our Lord's command to Peter, "Strengthen thy brethren." From this it is possible to conclude that Christ saw the need of praying for Peter on that solemn occasion, but nothing more definite can be said about it.

---

[1] Cf. Margreth, *Das Gebetsleben Jesu,* p. 234.

[2] *Evangelium secundum Lucam,* p. 589 f.

The text of the Savior's prayer is divided into three parts: (1) "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat"; (2) "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail"; (3) "And do thou, when once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren."

1. "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat." Our Lord here addressed the Prince of the Apostles directly, but at the same time he declares that all the Apostles would go through a sifting process. This is clear from the use of the plural pronoun "you" in both the Greek and Latin texts. The seriousness of the matter is impressed on St. Peter's mind; our Lord calls him Simon, and repeats his name. In Sacred Scripture such repetitions[3] are not uncommon, and usually they indicate the solemnity of the occasion, a sign of affection, or the desire on the part of the speaker to attract attention.[4] The present occasion was a solemn one, our Lord speaks affectionately to Peter, and most likely he repeats his name to attract the attention of the Apostles. A little before, they had disputed among themselves about which of them was reputed to be the greatest (Lk. 22:24); our Lord puts an end to their discussion when Peter is again pointed out as their head, and as the one upon whom it rested to confirm the others.

But it is often wondered why our Savior addressed the Prince of the Apostles as Simon instead of Peter. Already for quite some time he was known by the name Peter. Commentators see in our Lord's use of the name "Simon" an indication that Peter still retained some of his former traits of weakness. This interpretation seems to be borne out by the fact that a short while later, when Peter seemed to exhibit a distinct weakness our Lord addressed him again by his old name of Simon instead of Peter: "Simon, dost thou sleep?" (Mk. 14:37; cf. Jn. 21:15). Certainly at the time, the Prince of the Apostles did not deserve to be called Peter, for within a short time he would deny our Lord.

---

[3] Cf. Gen. 22:11; Ex. 3:4; Lk. 10:41; Acts 9:4, etc.

[4] Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N. T.*, p. 258 f.

The trial of Peter and the Apostles is figuratively described by our Lord: "Behold, Satan has desired to have you, that *he may sift you as wheat.*" The real force of the Greek verb *ἐξητήσατο* (desired to have) is "to obtain by asking." The use of the aorist here implies success in the demand: Satan had not merely asked or desired to have the Apostles in his power, but he actually obtained them by asking. He desired to have them completely in his power. In this, however, he was not totally successful, but he did obtain permission from Christ to try the Apostles. The reference to Satan's desire naturally reminds us of Job's trial (1:6-12; 2:1-6): just as Satan received permission from God to try Job, so our divine Savior allowed him to try the faith of the Apostles.

The purpose of Satan is revealed, that is, "to sift all of them as wheat." Although the verb *σινιάσαι* (to sift) is used only by St. Luke in the New Testament, the metaphor is clear (cf. Am. 9:9; Lk. 3:17). The term describes a winnowing process, and the desire on Satan's part to take and sift the Apostles. At the beginning of our Lord's Public Life, St. John the Baptist (Lk. 3:17) describes Christ performing a similar process, but with this difference: our Lord used a fan and winnowed to get rid of the chaff, but Satan used a fan and winnowed to get rid of the wheat. In this we see the particular malice of Satan who did not desire to prove the constancy and fidelity of the Apostles, but rather the desire to disturb and to agitate them in such a manner that they would fall from the faith. Satan aimed at the ruin of the Apostles. But, at the same time, we see him acting only under the authority of Christ, for he could not try the Apostles until he had received permission.

2. "But I have prayed for thee that thy faith may not fail." These words of our Lord manifest his solicitude for Peter in a special way. As man, Christ offered a prayer for Peter, and as the Son of God, his prayer was graciously heard. In commenting upon these words St. Cyril of Alexandria says: "Iterum nobis conformatur, et secundum humanitatis modulum loquitur, ille qui Deus erat, quamquam caro factus."[5] In sharp contrast to the first part, the singular is used here. According to the text, Christ prayed for Peter and not for the other Apostles. But we are not

---

[5] MPG 72, 119 f.

to imagine that Christ did not include them in his prayer. Elsewhere we know that our Savior did pray for them when he said: "I have manifested thy name to the men whom thou hast given me out of the world . . . I pray for them; not for the world do I pray, but for those whom thou hast given me, because they are thine . . . Sanctify them in truth . . . Father, I will that where I am, they, also, whom thou hast given me may be with me; in order that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me, because thou hast loved me before the creation of the world" (Jn. 17:6,9,17,24). Moreover, although Christ singled out Peter and prayed for him intentionally, it is most likely that he included all the Apostles in this special prayer. In this sense many commentators understand the words "for thee." St. Augustine, e.g., says: "Quid ambigitur? Pro Petro rogabat, et pro Jacobo et Joanne non rogabat ut ceteros taceam. Manifestum est in Petro omnes contineri: rogans pro Petro, pro omnibus rogasse dignoscitur. Semper enim in praeposito populus, aut corripitur aut laudatur."[6] Our Lord, therefore, prayed for all the Apostles, but especially for Peter whose faith was more exposed to danger; his faith, as it were, was the foundation of the Apostles, faith in Christ. Consequently, Christ's prayer was an official one in so far as it touched upon the office that Peter was to hold.

The prayer of Christ for Peter was efficacious. Although the text does not expressly mention it, it is evident from Peter's repentance and the words of our divine Savior: "Father, I give thee thanks that thou hast heard me. Yet I knew that thou always hearest me" (Jn. 11:42; cf. Heb. 5:7). Our Lord did not pray that Peter should be freed from the sifting of Satan; neither did he pray that Peter should not deny him, but he prayed that Peter's faith should not be extinguished permanently. When Peter denied our Lord his faith and love in Christ did not utterly fail or die; they were simply weak or inadequate for the moment. In other words, Peter, by his denial, did not lose his belief in the supernatural character of Jesus: he did not deny that Christ was the Messias or the Son of God, but he simply denied that he knew Jesus.[7] Concerning the shaken faith of Peter, Theophylactus observes: "quamvis brevi tempore concutiendus sis, habes tamen recondita semina fidei, etiamsi folia abjecerit spiritus invadentis, radix tamen vivet, et non deficiet fides tua."[8]

---

[6] *Lb. Quaest. V. et N. T.*, MPL 35, 2270.

[7] Cf. Calmet, *Comm. Litteralis in S.S.*, p. 559; Lucas Brugensis, *Comm. in St. Lucam*, Col. 1334.

3. "And do thou, when once thou hast turned again; strengthen thy brethren." Our English version renders literally and faithfully the sense of the Greek and Latin texts. As it stands our Lord once more singles out Peter and expressly commands him to confirm the Apostles in the faith after he has returned or repented of his sin. But, on the other hand, according to some authors, a particular problem of exegesis occurs here concerning the interpretation of the Greek participle *ἐπιστρέψας* (conversus —converted or turned) in our text. The participle is taken by them as a Hebraism and translated adverbially by "again" or "in turn." Consequently, the meaning would be: "You again confirm your brethren." It is apparent immediately that a doubt is raised as to whether or not our Lord is referring to Peter's repentance or his duty to re-confirm the Apostles in the faith.

The problem, therefore, centers around the use and interpretation of the Greek verb *ἐπιστρέφειν* (convertere—to convert or turn). Variations of this verb occur quite frequently in Sacred Scripture; strictly speaking, the verb is transitive, but it is also used intransitively. In the Old Testament it generally implies conversion or a return to God. It is used transitively, e.g., in Deut. 4:3: "After all the things aforesaid shall find thee, in the latter time thou shalt return to the Lord thy God, and shalt hear his voice."[9] The Septuagint translates the Hebrew שׁוּב by *ἐπιστρέφειν*. At times it is used intransitively, e.g., in Jer. 3:12: "Return, O rebellious Israel, saith the Lord, and I will not turn away my face from you" (cf. 3:14,22). In this sense it is also used transitively and intransitively in the New Testament.[10] Considered from this viewpoint, the interpretation of the text in the sense of conversion or repentance is evident.

On the other hand, authors who maintain that a Hebraism underlies the text of our Lord's petition for Peter cite many examples from the Old and New Testaments to prove their point. For example, in Ps. 70:20,21 we read: "And turning thou hast brought me to life . . . and turning thou hast comforted me," that is, "again thou hast brought me to life . . . and again thou hast comforted me." A similar example occurs in Ps. 77:41: "And they turned back and tempted God: and grieved the holy one of Israel," that is, "again they tempted God: and grieved the holy one of Israel."[11]

---

[8] MPG 123, 682.

[9] Cf. 1 Kgs. 7:3; 3 Kgs. 8:33,48; Isa. 19:22, etc.

[10] Cf. Mt. 9:22; 12:44; Lk. 1:16,17; 17:4; Acts 9:40, etc.

These examples are clear, and no one denies that the Hebrew idiom can be understood adverbially. The Hebrew language has few adverbs and, as a result, another finite verb is often added to describe an action more exactly. Examples of this kind are not wanting in the New Testament. This is not surprising, for our Lord spoke Aramaic, and, naturally, its idiom influenced the writers of the New Testament. Moreover, Hebraisms are not out of place in St. Luke's Gospel, for again the Evangelist, whose mother tongue was probably Greek, depended upon Aramaic sources, and expressed its idiom in Greek.

In this connection Father Holzmeister[12] has collected and explained adverbially many texts of the New Testament as Hebraisms of this type. In the Acts (15:36), for example, the same Greek verb is used in the plural form: "Now some time after Paul said to Barnabas, 'Let us return and visit the brethren in all the cities where we have preached the word of the Lord, to see how they are doing'," that is, "let us visit again, etc." A similar example occurs in Mt. 18:2 f.: "And Jesus called a little child to him, set it in the midst of them, and said, 'Amen I say to you, unless you turn and become like little children, you will not enter the kingdom of heaven'," that is, "unless you become again like little children, etc." Again, in the Acts (7:42) we read: "God turned and gave them up to serve the host of heaven," that is, God again gave them up to serve the host of heaven.

In general, commentators and scholars of biblical Greek admit the presence of these and similar Hebraisms in the New Testament. But there seems to be a certain amount of timidity or hesitancy on the part of translators to express the idiom by a corresponding form in the vernacular. If, however, clearness is an outstanding quality of a version, then the original Hebrew idiom in these cases should be considered. Moreover, since editions of the Bible in the vernacular are published only after ecclesiastical approbation, then it is the duty of ecclesiastical authorities to assume a practical attitude in the matter and to decide accordingly. In this connection, it should be noted that translations of the Bible made in the past twenty years or more differ notably from the older versions in that many Hebraisms have been eliminated by substituting the proper grammatical expression in the vernacular.

---

[11] Cf. 4 Kgs. 23:16; Gen. 26:18; Ps. 6:5; 84:7.

[12] *Verbum Domini,* Vol. 12 (1932), pp. 295-302.

Therefore, presupposing for the time being that a Hebraism exists in the text of our Savior's petition for Peter, the meaning would be: "You once again (or, "in turn") confirm your brethren." If this is the case, then Christ simply commanded Peter to strengthen the Apostles in the faith as he did no previous occasions, as, for example, when Peter answered for the Twelve on the occasion of our Lord's discourse on the Eucharist: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of everlasting life, and we have come to believe and to know that thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (Jn. 6:69 f.). Certainly Peter's answer helped to form and confirm the Apostles' belief in Christ. On another occasion Peter performed a similar office and confirmed the convictions of the Apostles when he said: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God" (Mt. 16:16).

This is a possible interpretation of the text and one accepted by both ancient and modern exegetes.[13] In theory, practically all authors admit the presence of Hebrewisms in the New Testament, but the majority deny that Christ's command to St. Peter contains a Hebraism. Schegg[14] and Schanz,[15] for example, claim that the Hebrew verb שׁוּב is only used idiomatically in those places where the discourse refers to the same subject who does something again or repeats the same action. This is observed in the examples cited from the Old Testament. According to these authors, this is not the case in our text where the subjects are different: "I have prayed—you confirm." They conclude, therefore, that the past participle should not be translated adverbially. But, Margreth,[16] on the contrary, claims that our text is an example wherein the idiom demands a repetition of the same action: Christ prayed for Peter and strengthened him, so that Peter "again" or "in turn" might strengthen the Apostles.

Be this as it may, the majority of exegetes prefer to take and to understand the verb intransitively according to its literal sense. They contend that the context demands this, for our Lord declares in verse thirty-one that Satan has designs on the Apostles and especially Peter. Here our Lord seems to have in mind Peter's fall. In verse thirty-four he explicitly foretells Peter's denial: "I tell thee, Peter, a cock will not crow this day, until thou hast thrice denied that thou knowest me." It does not seem unusual, therefore, to see in our Lord's words a reference to Peter's return or repentence. It is not a question of Peter's conversion in the strict sense of the term, but of some temporal aberration on Peter's part from which he returned and sought forgiveness. In this sense the Revised New Testament evidently understands the text: "When once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren."

---

[13] Maldonatus, *Comm. in Quattuor Evang.*, p. 1186; Margreth, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[14] *Lukas*, p. 257.

[15] *Kommentar über das Evang. des heiligen Lucas*, p. 516.

[16] *Op. cit.*, p. 231.

Finally, our Savior points out that it was the chief duty of Peter to strengthen his brethren. The context evidently refers to confirmation in the faith, for Satan's thrusts were primarily directed against the faith of the Apostles. Christ prayed that Peter's faith should remain firm, and, as a consequence, his unfailing faith should be the foundation of the Apostles' faith. That Peter fulfilled these words of Christ and confirmed his brethren in the faith is apparent from the position of authority which he held in the organization and development of the primitive Christian Church, especially on the day of Pentecost and at the Council of Jerusalem (cf. Acts 1:15; 15:7).

According to the text Peter's office extended only to the Apostles. But the term "brethren" also includes all Christians, that is, all the faithful who believe in Christ through the medium of Peter and his successors. In this sense the term "brethren" is often used in the New Testament.[17] Our divine Savior prayed for the Prince of the Apostles for two special reasons: first, that his faith and that of his successors should never fail; and secondly, that Peter should be able to confirm his brethren in the faith. In the providence of God, the petition of Christ's prayer is still realized after nineteen hundred years. Peter in the person of his successors still continues to confirm his brethren in the faith, and he will do so till the end of time.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

Augustinian College
Washington, D. C.

---

[17] Cf. Mt. 23:8; Jn. 21:33; Acts 6:3, etc.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES

It is an axiom that grace does not destroy nature, and this axiom is verified nowhere more strikingly than in the life of St. Paul. The overpowering grace, the blinding vision of the risen Christ on the Damascus Road, which changed him from Saul, the rabid persecutor of the Christians, into Paul, the zealous Apostle of the Gentiles, left intact Saul, the Hebrew with his zeal and pride of ancestry. All the Jewish influences in his life, his early training and later education, and his deep acquaintance with the Old Testament Scriptures remained, but the religious blindness which he had shared in common with his contemporaries had been removed by the transforming vision, even before the scales of physical blindness, resultant from it, had fallen from his eyes, and he saw clearly that the Old Testament was merely the shadow and type of the reality of the new dispensation.

Esteeming it a great grace to be a Christian—he could count all things else as loss except the excellent knowledge of Christ—he was not unmindful of the privilege that had been his in formerly being a Jew. St. Paul recounts the privileges of the Jewish race in his Epistle to the Romans. To the Israelites belonged the adoption as of children. They were God's chosen people; to them belonged the glory—that visible luminous presence of God over the Ark and that vast assemblage of stupendous miracles performed for the special benefit of their nation—to them belonged the Testament, the covenant of God, the giving of the law, the service of God, the divine promises, the patriarchs and prophets, and greatest of all "Christ according to the flesh, who is over all things, God blessed forever" (Rom. 9:5).

This veneration for the glories of the Old Testament was naturally born of his education which was almost exclusively scriptural. Like the ordinary Jewish boy of his time, St. Paul learned to spell and read from the sacred text. This elementary education began under the tutorship of his father and of the Jewish Rabbis in Tarsus of Cilicia, where he was born. In accordance with the capacity of his childish intellect he learned the Law and the traditions of the ancients. His father, who was a strict Pharisee, had high ambitions for his son. Desirous of seeing him a Rabbi he sent him to Jerusalem to sit at the feet of the greatest exponent of the Law at that time, Gamaliel. Here St. Paul acquired his profound knowledge of the Old Testament.

The influences of his formative years manifested themselves later on when, as Paul the Apostle, he preached and wrote to the newly founded Christian churches. The Jewish and biblical influences of his younger years are most evident in his writings. In fact, the thought and language of the Old Testament, and its quotations, enter so essentially into St. Paul's Epistles that if one were to remove the Old Testament references from them they could be condensed into a few brief but well nigh unintelligible chapters.

The Epistle to the Romans serves as an excellent example of his thorough familiarity with the Old Testament and of his generous use of it. This Epistle reveals his acquaintance with nineteen different books of the Old Testament ranging from the Pentateuch to the prophet Malachy. Many of these books he quotes verbatim not once but many times, and this is particularly true of the Pentateuch, the Prophet Isaias, and the Psalms.

St. Paul, as one naturally expects, makes a greater use of Old Testament Scripture in those Epistles which were addressed to churches having a large percentage of Jewish converts than in those which were intended for the Gentile Christians. The same is true of his sermons. St. Paul was a true psychologist. He knew how to obtain the best results. He was conscious of the supreme regard and veneration that the Jews had for the words of Scripture and was fully aware that citations of it would bear for them the full force of its divine authority. The use of Scripture was not, however, without effect on the Gentiles, for St. Paul knew that they at least could understand from the inspired records that the religion of Christ had been in times past foretold, prefigured, and prepared.

St. Paul's use of the Old Testament is so frequent and his references to its facts and events, its terms and names, its personages and places so constant that were one unacquainted with the associations grouped about those great names: those significant and marvelous events, those hallowed places and institutions of Jewish history, the themes of St. Paul's Epistles would be almost devoid of meaning. But, on the contrary, if one be well acquainted with the Old Testament, the Epistles of St. Paul take on a deeper meaning and are appreciated more highly. To such a one the mention of Abraham is more than a name. It summons up the great father of many nations, with his outstanding life of remarkable faith, whereby he left his people and went out to seek the land of promise looking for a city that has foundations whose builder and maker is God. To such a one the rugged peaks of Sinai covered with thick clouds, belching smoke and echoing with the thunder of God's voice are visible realities when mention is made of Mt. Sinai, the Law, and Moses. The desert and the forty years of wandering come back to mind with all the murmuring of the hard-hearted people sojourning in it, unimpressed by the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, or by the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, or by the food sent down from heaven for forty years. To such a one the statement of St. Paul that he is the Apostle of Christ, who is of the seed of David, according to the flesh, is pregnant with memories of the glorious deeds of Israel's prophet king, whose life of innocence and grace, of sin and repentance, of glory and achievement, is portrayed in the Old Testament. St. Paul's mention of the Tabernacle, of the Holy of Holies, of the altar of incense, of the priests and victims, recalls to such a one all the beauty of God's house, with its marble and gold, its beautiful tapestries, its sweet-smelling incense, its heavenly psalmody, its burning holocausts, and the glory of God's presence over all. St. Paul's Epistles are capable of doing all this and much more, for in them the figures and types of the Old Law retain their ancient beauty, and what is more, acquire added lustre from the bright light shed upon them by the revelation of the new Law.

In his second Epistle to Timothy St. Paul reminds his favorite disciple that "all scripture is inspired by God and useful for teaching, for reproving, for correcting, for instructing in justice" (2 Tim. 3:15-17). The uses to which he wished Timothy to put the Sacred Scriptures in the ministry of the Word, were uses which St. Paul himself had already adopted in his Apostolic labors. In his sermons, instructions, and Epistles, St. Paul's teaching, whether it be moral or doctrinal instruction, is couched either in the thought of Scripture, or in its very words when these can in any way be adduced as proofs or illustrations. It has been said of St. Paul that he thinks in Old Testament quotations, and this is no exaggeration, for in many cases where his thought coincides with that of the Old Testament, St. Paul expresses the thought in the words of Scripture rather than in his own language.

He proves his doctrinal thesis that Christ excels the angels in dignity, in the words of the Old Testament, chiefly those of the

Book of Psalms. He appeals to Genesis to demonstrate that marriage produces a bond between husband and wife, whereby they become one flesh. He cites Exodus to prove that the love of one's neighbor is the fulfilling of the law. When he had recourse to apostolic severity and administered reproof, he justified his language by an appeal to Scripture. This is particularly true of the third chapter of Romans, where he multiplies his scriptural quotations in support of his charge that both Jews and Greeks were under sin. Finally, the Old Testament supplies him with words of exhortation and examples for imitation. His plea to the Romans to overcome evil by good and not to seek revenge finds divine support in the words of Deuteronomy, "Revenge is mine and I will repay, says the Lord" (Deut. 32:35). The words of Isaias, "In an accepted time I have heard thee and in the day of salvation have I helped thee" (Isa. 49:8), remind him to impress upon his disciples that the present is the time of grace, the acceptable time and the day of salvation. He crowds into his eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews a litany of personages remarkable for their faith in Old Testament times, and they remain there for all future generations, splendid examples for admiration and imitation.

St. Paul's rabbinical training is plainly evident in his use of the Old Testament. (Cf. *C.B.Q.* vol. III, No. 1, p. 15 "Rabbinic Exegesis and Pauline Exegesis," Rev. John Collins S.J., S.S.L.) But in justice to St. Paul it must be said that his use of rabbinical methods is tempered by moderation and eminent good judgment. Therefore it can not be said of him, as of his contemporaries, that he strove to suspend "dogmatic mountains on textual hairs."

There is one outstanding point in his interpretation, however, which should not be overlooked, because it may be called St. Paul's special contribution to exegesis, and that is his abundant typical and mystical interpretation of the Old Testament. Nowhere in the New Testament does it appear more clearly than in his Epistles that the facts, events, and persons of the Old Testament are types of the facts, events, and persons of the New Testament, and that indeed the whole Old Testament is a figure of, and preparation for, the gospel—"the Law has been our tutor in Christ" (Gal. 3:24)—for St. Paul is constantly pointing out the type and associating it with its antitype and fulfillment in the New Testament, showing most clearly, as Augustine says, that "the New lies hid in the Old Testament, and the Old is revealed in the New."

St. Paul had extraordinary qualities of mind and heart. His was a magnetic personality in spite of physical weakness. His sermons were effective. His Epistles, burning. They are as living and captivating to-day as they were when first written. They possess power and authority, and the reason for all this is not far to seek. Their charm and power lie in the perfect mingling of the inspired words of the New Law with the inspired thought and language of the Old Law. One who has an acquaintance with St. Paul will at the same time possess a sympathetic acquaintance with the Old Testament. One who is conscious that the word of Scripture is the power of God unto sanctification will readily turn to St. Paul for light and guidance, inspiration and edification. To the sacred orator St. Paul's Epistles furnish ready and fit weapons for the warfare against the powers of darkness, supplied both from the Old and New Testaments. Precisely because of the intimate connection of the Old Testament with the Epistles of St. Paul, one may say of the person who draws from St. Paul's scriptural treasure house, that he is like to the prudent householder, spoken of by our Lord, who brings forth out of his treasure "new things and old" (Mt. 13:52).

CHARLES J. COSTELLO, O.M.I.

Oblate Scholasticate
Washington, D. C.

EXPOSITION OF THE MISSAL EPISTLES FROM ROMANS

V

The following passage from Romans is the epistle for the Votive Mass *Pro Remissione Peccatorum*:

7:22 I am delighted with the law of God according to the
23 inner man, | but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind and making me prisoner to the law of sin that is in my members.

24 Unhappy man that I am! Who will deliver me from the body of this death? The grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

This passage is very appropriate for the Mass to which it is assigned, for it mentions the ever present stimulus which so frequently goads fallen man into sin, and the only effective remedy against human nature's universal proclivity to evil. The goad which is ever prodding unhappy man off the path of duty into the byways of iniquity is his unruly inclinations, which are in a constant state of rebellion against the law of God and the guidance of right reason. The remedy, which, thanks be to the fatherly mercy of God, is always present and available, is divine grace merited for us by Jesus Christ in His sacrificial death on Calvary.

The passage is the conclusion of a lengthy discussion in which St. Paul, desiring to bring home to his readers that Christians are freed from the Law of Moses, makes statements about it which seem to imply that it is evil. He accuses it, for example, of arousing sinful passions (7:5). But in spite of that, St. Paul insists, the Law is not evil; it is not the cause of sin and therefore of sin's penalty, death. It is merely the occasion of man's fall, something good and holy in itself which sin has abused as an instrument to lead man astray.

In proof of his contention that the Law is good the Apostle appeals to the experience of all high-minded men. Their superior faculties approve of the prescriptions of the Law; they recognize in it a noble ideal which they strive to realize. But at the same time there is in man a lower element, something akin to the bestial, which drags him down and impels him, in spite of his better judgment, to depart from the ideal and indulge the cravings of his lower appetites.

There can scarcely be any doubt that St. Paul has the Mosaic Law in mind, and mainly its moral precepts embodied in the decalogue, one of which he cites: *Thou shalt not lust.* But his reasoning applies to all prohibitive law. Of its very nature it whets desire; it irks man's love of independence and stirs him to revolt. As St. John Chrysostom remarks: "When we desire a thing and then are hindered from getting it, the flame of desire is but increased." This is true to a certain extent even of Adam and Eve before their fall. Although their minds were wonderfully keen and their wills sound and vigorous, and although there could consequently be no incitement to evil from within their well ordered and grace-adorned souls, yet the account of their temptation and fall as given in Genesis clearly shows the Tempter skillfully and successfully making use of the precept God had placed on Adam and Eve to stir them to rebellion: "Why has God commanded you that you should not eat of every tree of paradise?"

The Apostle's reasoning applies to all law in another way, whether the law be Mosaic, Christian or natural. Law of itself does not supply the necessary strength for its observance.

Since the Apostle's reasoning applies to all law, the psychological experience he describes is not merely his own, neither is it exclusively that of the good Jew, although that is what St. Paul has in mind. The same inner conflict is the lot of the high-minded pagan as well. Everyone is familiar with the oft quoted words of Ovid: "video meliora proboque; deteriora sequor." Other pagan philosophers, Plato, Epictetus, Euripides, Seneca, voice similar sentiments.

Moreover, in spite of the assistance of supernatural grace lavished in great abundance on the Christian, he, too, may experience in varying degrees of intensity the same inner struggle, which is not confined to the lukewarm and indifferent but happens also even in the souls of great saints. This inner struggle, so well known to men the world over at all times and in every condition of life, is convincing proof that the law is good; it has the approval of common sense.

Since the experience here described is shared by all the children of Adam, except of course the Blessed Virgin Mary, the "I" of St. Paul, everyone will admit, stands for more than the Apostle's individual personality. It represents man.

There has, however, been considerable disagreement as to the type of man St. Paul here has in mind. We think with Father Lagrange that in verses 7-12, the Apostle is thinking of Adam before his fall. He had had no practical experience of sin. He had not experienced any special attraction for the forbidden fruit until the Tempter had called to his attention this restriction on his liberty, and paraded before his imagination the fictitious results which the father of lies convinced Adam would flow from his disobedience. Thus Sin, evil in general in one or another of its manifold operations and effects, in this case the Devil, made use of the prohibition placed on our first parents to stir them to revolt. Without that prohibitive law the Tempter would have been deprived of a most effective appeal to Adam. There was a time when our first Father was living a marvelous, supernatural life; he was the friend and intimate of God. "Sin was dead," as St. Paul puts it, i.e., was comparatively weak, without any effective instrument to use to entice man to sin. But then the divine positive law, the precept prohibiting the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, was imposed on him, and the Devil, skillfully and artfully appealing to it, introduced sin, brought sin to life, induced Adam to disobey, and thus brought about his death.

From verse 12 to 24 the man under consideration is fallen man, victim of the consequences of Adam's sin, a disordered nature with lower appetites and instincts in rebellion against the law of God and the guidance of right reason. In this explanation St. Paul gives a quick survey of the entire history of sin from its entrance into the world in Eden down to the overthrow of its dominance over man by our Lord Jesus Christ.[1]

St. Paul uses such strong language to describe the conflict between the higher and lower faculties in man as to seem to relieve him of all responsibility. "I do not understand what I do, for it is not what I wish that I do, but what I hate, that I do . . . To wish is within my power, but I do not find the strength to accomplish what is good" (7:15,18). St. Paul's habit of thus stressing a point so vehemently is one reason why "in these (his) epistles there are certain things difficult to understand, which the unlearned and the unstable distort . . . to their own destruction" (2 Pet. 3:16). We can never, therefore, hope to get his meaning correctly when we consider a passage in its isolation without reference not only to the immediate context but also to his general teaching. In this passage the Apostle is not discussing the point of human responsibility. Elsewhere, in numerous passages, he makes it as clear as can be that he does not absolve sinners, because of the struggle here described, of responsibility and guilt. If he did not admit freedom of choice, his repeated exhortations to the performance of duty would be meaningless and he could not declare that sinners are inexcusable (cf. Rom. 1:21-22; 2:1). Neither would there be any purpose in all men appearing before the tribunal of Christ, "so that each one may receive what he has won through the body, according to his works, whether good or evil" (2 Cor. 5:10).

---

[1] The more common opinion is that the "I" represents St. Paul himself. As a youth he was living in innocence, then after he had become acquainted with the Mosaic Law, he came to know concupiscence and Sin made use of that propensity to evil to seduce him. One may consult Prat: *La Théologie de S. Paul,*^{9} I, pp. 268 ff. Eng. Tr. by Stoddard, I, pp. 227 ff.

These introductory remarks are abnormally lengthy, but they are a necessary preliminary to the explanation of the short passage which forms the epistle for the Mass *Pro Remissione Peccatorum.*

I am delighted with the law of God according to the inner man.

The law of God, as we have seen, is primarily the Mosaic Law and especially its moral precepts, but by extension can be taken to stand for any enactment of God, which, proceeding from His wisdom and goodness, is an expression of infinite love. The inner man is rational man, that inner, spiritual element in man's makeup which is attracted to justice, sobriety, kindness, self-restraint, moderation and charity, which recognizes the beauty of virtue and high ideals. It is that part of man which is particularly akin to God, that element by which man is said to have been created in God's image and likeness. This part of man's nature *is delighted with,* finds satisfaction in the divine Law, considers it reasonable, good and holy.

But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind and making me prisoner to the law of sin that is in my members. This other law in the members, i.e., dwelling in the unruly flesh, is concupiscence, i.e., the constant rebellion of the lower appetites against the control of right reason and the law of God, the craving for selfish gratification of any kind whatever beyond what is allowed by the dictates of God's law and right reason. This may be called a law, as St. Thomas says, for a twofold reason: first, because of similar effects, for as a law induces a man to do good, so concupiscence induces him to commit sin; second, in reference to its cause. Concupiscence has a twofold cause: first, sin itself, which acquires dominion over the sinner and imposes on him the law of concupiscence, and second, God, who has decreed this penalty for sin.

This law of unruly impulses makes war against the law of the mind. This latter is merely the divine law as recognized and approved by the mind, by the inner man, by man's common sense. The sad result of this unholy warfare is victory for the law of sin. It takes man prisoner, reducing him to a state of slavery, perpetually tantalizing and torturing him until finally it breaks down his resistance and has him doing its wretched bidding. It ends by making man the slave of degrading impulses and unreasoning passion.

Such is the miserable state of poor man, hapless victim of concupiscence, the consequence of original sin. He sees the beauty of God's law; he wants to observe it, but sin, that is, the strong bent of his disordered nature to evil, dwelling in his members, makes ceaseless and relentless warfare on him and finally reduces him to ignominious slavery. No wonder that the Apostle cries out in this tragic situation:

Unhappy man that I am! A slave writhing in a shameful and vile servitude, yearning to be set free from his pitiable plight but utterly helpless to do anything towards his rescue.

Who will deliver me from the body of this death? Such is the fervent plea of fallen man, whose role St. Paul here assumes, for a Savior. Life in such conditions is a living death; the body, prey to disorderly passions fierce and unrelenting, constantly drags poor man, in spite of his high ideals, down into the mire of shameful deeds which bring eternal death to the soul. "Rightly," remarks Origen, "is the body called a death-body because sin which is the cause of death dwells in it."

The Savior, so ardently summoned to the rescue of fallen man by the Apostle, has been most graciously granted to us by a loving heavenly Father. It is Jesus Christ who by His death on Golgotha has merited for us the grace, the supernatural aid and strength, to extricate ourselves from the slavery into which the folly of Adam has hurled the entire human race. In a splendid climax St. Paul answers his question: *The grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.*[2]

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

St. Mary's Seminary
Perryville, Missouri

---

[2] The approved Greek reading is: "*Thanks be to God through our Lord Jesus Christ.* If we put a period after *Thanks be to God* and supply a few words, the result is: *Thanks be to God! Rescue has been effected through Jesus Christ our Lord.*" Goodspeed and Spencer render the words in about this way.

OBSCURITIES IN THE LATIN PSALTER

XIV

85. Ps. 83:6-8. (Friday, at Sext.)

(6) Beatus vir, cujus est auxilium abs te: *ascensiones in corde suo disposuit,* (7) *in valle lacrymarum, in loco quem posuit.* (8) *Etenim benedictionem dabit legislator,* ibunt de virtute in virtutem: videbitur Deus deorum in Sion.

As this psalm centers its attention on the sanctuary, while the next to be noticed (86) is in praise of the city, a word may be in season concerning the use of a few place-names and their various connotations. "Sion" is the name given by David to the small but strongly entrenched "Jerusalem" of the Jebusites, after he had captured it and made it his capital. Thus "Sion," "Jerusalem" and "the City of David" properly denote one and the same town. Next, "Sion" is often extended to the whole of the narrow eastern spur between the Tyropoeon and the Kidron, on the midway elevation of which the town originally stood. (Properly this spur as a whole was named "the Ophel," i.e., "the bump" or "swelling," when definite topography was in mind.) It was the northerly summit or base of the spur, apart from the city and well above it, which Solomon chose for the temple site. Hence "Sion" as applied to the whole hill might, by a further metonymy, designate the temple itself, which was properly distinguished as "the sanctuary" or "the house of Yahweh." Especially might "Sion" be thus applied from the viewpoint of one at a distance, somewhat as we refer to the Holy See as "Rome." The group of expressions may sometimes be confusing except as determined by their contexts; in Ps. 86 we shall find "Sion" clearly restricted to the city. These remarks apply, of course, to the language of the Old Testament. The "Sion" of the Crusaders' tradition lay far to the west of the hill of Ophel, and may have acquired this borrowed name as early as Byzantine times, when little trace was left of David's ancient site and occupation had moved northward and westward to nearly its present limits.

The theme of Ps. 83, reaching its climax in verse 11, is the supreme privilege of being welcome within the House of God. This chord is clearly sounded in the opening strophe (1-5), which culminates in the thought of the unending chorus of praise. In the second strophe (6-9) the theme seems to change to the devotion impelling worshippers to seek the sanctuary from afar, perhaps on stated festivals, and to the providence which rewards them with blessings on the toilsome way.

Witness to 6a is fairly unanimous. TM has "Happy the man who has strength by Thee" (through Thy gift), with which Jerome closely agrees. The variations which begin thereafter may best be discussed with Jerome's version of 6-8 before us entire (including his division of 7-8, which follows TM rather than LXX-V):

(6) *Beatus homo cujus fortitudo est in te:*
semitae in corde ejus.
(7) *Transeuntes in valle fletus,*
fontem ponent eam:
benedictionem quoque amicietur doctor.
(8) *Ibunt de fortitudine in fortitudinem:*
parebunt apud Deum in Sion.

The *semitae* are properly "highways," radically "raised (ways)," main routes well banked and ballasted as for chariots and other heavy traffic. Here the word is probably figurative for "upward journeys" or "pilgrimages" (Zo. *sacra itinera*), so that *ascensiones* is apt enough. *Ejus,* passing from example to class, is *eorum* in TM. Thus a complete sentence, "Pilgrimages are in their heart," concludes 6. LXX-V would include *disposuit,* but the versions and most MSS of TM pass on this word to 7, as do all critical editors of the Hebrew.

Thus 7 opens with a variance between *disposuit* and TM. Schleusner thinks LXX read a verb rather different from ours, meaning "arranged." Boylan, in addition to this, notes that a much more similar verb, differing only in the often exchanged *daleth* and *resh,* could have meant "made" [apparently as "wrought" or "effected"] to a translator more familiar with Aramaic than with biblical Hebrew. Still, if the verb belongs to 7a, its form in TM gives much better sense, being the participle "passing over" (Jer. *transeuntes*)—or, with final *waw* for *yodh,* the perfect tense, "they passed over." Here the typically Hebrew construction "passing over in the valley" merely amounts to "crossing the valley" in our idiom.

Fletus, the next disputed point, is attested by all the versions but Symmachus, and is probably original. Gesenius' modern editors find an obstacle in its final letter, yet Gesenius himself accepts the form, as it stands, for "weeping." He also thinks "the

Valley of Weeping," not otherwise known, is an actual spot thus named; but since pilgrims to Sion must come from many directions even in the days of the later monarchy, the name would rather seem (at least here) to be a sort of symbol for any difficult terrain offering some risk to the traveller's survival.

Jerome's 7b, *fontem ponent eam,* is close to TM's "a water-source they make it." But the original of *fontem* was read as *locum* by LXX-V (the governing *in* being merely repeated from *in valle* under a mistaken sense of apposition). Bird's ingenious but involved emendations of this and the following sentence create more questions than they serve to decide. As to the Hebrew for *fons, waw* instead of *yodh* would indeed give us "dwelling-place," but the extant form, "spring" or "source," seems better attested by early witness, and also fitter to the context. Thus 7 entire would read, "Crossing a valley of weeping, they make it a spring."

Difficulty revives with TM's and Jerome's 7c (our 8a in the Vulgate). *Etenim benedictionem dabit legislator* is only partly improved upon by *benedictionem quoque amicietur doctor. Dabit* (LXX-V) is hard to account for in any explanation, and Jerome's *amicietur* agrees with TM in "clothes" or "enwraps." Pursuing the idea of an irrigated valley, *benedictio* assumes one of its recognized meanings, agricultural produce. Last, in the usual order, comes the subject of "clothes," which turns out to be neither *legislator* nor *doctor*, but a perfectly similar noun-form of quite different derivation denoting "(the first) rain," that of the late autumn in Palestine. The sentence becomes "With blessing, too, the rain covers it."

Thus the pilgrims' very trials are converted into benefits, so that (8) they increase in vigor and resolution. In the last member *Deus deorum,* while possible, is doubtful in its present construction, and its only support lies in a vowel. Jerome approves the vowel of TM (not written in his time, though pronounced), which makes the first word a preposition, while the second is "God" in the conventional plural form. Returning now to the Vulgate's division of 7-8, we may read the whole:

(6) Happy the man who has power by Thee;
pilgrimages are in their heart.
(7) *Crossing a valley of weeping,*
a well-spring they make it;

(8) *with blessing the rain too decks it.*
They go from strength to strength,
they appear before God in Sion.

86. Ps. 86:4-7. (Friday, at Sext.)

(4) Memor ero *Rahab* et Babylonis scientium me. Ecce alienigenae, et Tyrus, et populus Aethiopum, *hi fuerunt illic.* (5) *Numquid Sion dicet: Homo, et homo natus est in ea*: et ipse fundavit eam Altissimus? (6) Dominus narrabit in scripturis populorum *et principum*: *horum qui fuerunt in ea.* (7) *Sicut laetantium omnium habitatio est in te.*

"His establishment is upon hills of sanctuary"—so begins the Hebrew—but here that establishment is the City of Sion, which "Yahweh loves above all the tents of Jacob." Her citizens, in the standards of the time, ought to be such by right of birth. Yet this precious privilege is to be extended to all the nations, and that by the divine purpose. The Prophets often enough picture the Gentiles as mustering to Sion's standard, but do not go the length of calling them citizens by birthright. Whether this Psalm dates from the later monarchy (Bi.) or from after the Exile (Bo.), the thrice repeated "he was born there" is a bold figure of the world's allegiance to Sion—bold enough to deter our acceptance of the language, and perhaps responsible for some of what the text has suffered in early translation. On the whole it would seem that V could not quite take LXX at its word. Γίγνομαι, as "come to be," is often "be born" when applied to men, especially in its passive stems. Yet V renders this as merely *fuerunt illic* in both 4 and 6, while retaining *natus est in ea* for 5, in spite of the same explicit Hebrew phrase in all three. But a number of details require notice.

In 4 Yahweh Himself begins to claim His citizens. *Rahab* is a symbolic title for Egypt,[1] the great imperial rival of Babylonia. *Memor ero* falls short of an idiomatic pregnancy in the Hebrew causative form "commemorate," which is followed by a dative, *scientibus* (so too Jerome), instead of *scientium.* The strict construction, "I will commemorate Egypt and Babylonia to knowers of Me," really involves the sense "I will in record ascribe Egypt and Babylonia to those who know me" (Zo. *ac-*

---

[1] Cf. *CBQ* III, 4, p. 360, footnote.

censebo, "add to the list," expresses it perfectly). In 4b *alienigenae* (as usual in V) renders the Hebrew territorial name "Philistia,"[2] and *populus Aethiopum* paraphrases the racial name *Kush* (Ethiopia), while *Tyrus* speaks for itself. Even these too (*ecce!*) will be recorded as Sion's native citizens. But *hi fuerunt illic* misses LXX's explicit "these were born there" (where the plural, however, is adaptive rather than original). Jerome endorses both LXX and TM by writing, *Ecce Palaestina et Tyrus cum Aethiopia: iste natus est ibi.* "This one" is "each one" among these alien peoples, as his turn comes for inscription.

Numquid Sion sqq. is difficult, but probably not originally a question. LXX in most MSS reads μήτηρ Σιών, which the Roman Psalter (Jerome's first) follows with *Mater Sion.* In his own commentary on V, however, Jerome explains μήτηρ as an error of the Greeks for μήτι, though μὴ τῇ (the actual reading of one codex) would answer as well. Reading the Hebrew verb as passive (a matter of vowels only), either would come to "Let it not be said to Sion" (i.e. about her), and might have suggested *numquid* as a sort of rhetorical negative, "Shall it be said?" But either phrase standing before "Sion" defies reconstruction in Hebrew, and has no witness but LXX. The reading of TM, "And to (about) Sion," begins 5a in the Syriac, the second century Greek versions, and Jerome. The verb, as aforesaid, is passive in TM and in Jerome: *Ad Sion autem dicetur.* The Hebrew *homo et homo* is "man by man"—as it were "each" or "every man." "Yes, of Sion it will be said, 'Man by man was born in her.' " Moreover, "the Highest will establish her" in this universal relationship.

This last assurance is carried further in 6: "Yahweh will reckon, in recording the peoples, 'This one was born there.' " Jerome also has *iste natus est ibi.* Here LXX-V are astray on two points. First, *principum* is certainly out of its original place, which was just before *laetantium* in 7a. Secondly, the relative connection *horum qui* seems to have no support, and somewhat spoils the directness with which native allegiance is affirmed in 4 and 5. TM and Jerome are probably right.

But in 7 the original of *principum*, preceding that of *laetantium,* increases difficulty in the most obscure verse of the whole passage. The two Hebrew forms in TM are joined by "like" or "as." Since each of them can be taken in at least four ways, a discussion of all possible combinations would be tiresome. In any event, "all" goes with what follows it, not with the original of *laetantium*. Further, *habitatio* (the *locus* of Ps. 83: 7 above) again differs from *fons* by a choice between *waw* and *yodh;* and if the pronominal suffix is included, either "my dwellings" or "my springs" has good support. After much study the writer begs to suggest a choice between the agreement of two good authorities and a proposal of his own.

---

[2] The origin, through Greek channels, of the name "Palestine," which modern Zionism therefore abandons for "Land of Israel."

Certainly a good guide is Jerome's version, *Et cantores* [*al. cantabunt*] *quasi in choris*: *omnes fontes mei in te.* Zorell agrees: *Et cantabunt velut laete tripudiantes,* etc. Sources of water, a necessity everywhere, are treasures so precious in the arid East that the word may be a metaphor for every source of satisfaction. So, "they will be singing like dancers, 'All my springs are within thee.' "

This has strong support, and the temerity of proposing an original alternative is justified only by a linguistic difficulty and the ease of avoiding it. *Cantores* as a participle is well enough, though a change of *shin* to *sin* would make it *principes* (LXX-V). But to make the second word any participle of "dance" supposes the omission of a preformative *mem,* which is absent here, and between two letters at that. This aphaeresis, however, is so rare in active participles (cf. Kautzsch-Cowley, 52-s) as to seem most unlikely. A change, however, of *ḥeth* to *he* makes the form a perfectly regular participle of "boast" or "exult," and suggests "princes will be as they that boast" of the citizenship in Sion of themselves and their local subjects—an interpretation further strengthened by returning from *fontes mei* to *habitationes meae.* We would sum up as follows:

(4) I will ascribe *Egypt* and Babylonia to them that know Me,
lo, Philistia, and Tyre, with Ethiopia:
"This one was born there."

(5) *Yes, of Sion it will be said,*
"Man by man was born in her":
the Most High will establish her.

(6) Yahweh will reckon, in recording the peoples,
"This one was born there."

(7) *And they will be singing like dancers,*
"All my springs are within thee."

Or else:

(7) *And princes will be as if boasting,*
"All my dwellings are within thee."

(To be continued)

WILLIAM H. McCLELLAN, S.J.

Woodstock College, Maryland

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CORNER

LITHOSTROTOS

> "Pilate . . . . brought Jesus outside, and sat down on the judgment-seat, at a place called Lithostrotos, but in Hebrew, Gabbatha"
> (Jn. 19:13).

The castle of Antonia, situated on higher ground at the northwest corner of the temple enclosure, is now generally believed to have served Pilate as his official residence or praetorium on that tragic Friday morning when he condemned Jesus to death. As the Jews did not enter Gentile buildings during the Passover solemnities, Pilate set up his tribunal outside, probably in a courtyard at one of the castle gates. St. John states that the place was called Lithostrotos, but was also known to the Jews as Gabbatha.

Lithostrotos, according to its derivation, means "stone-paved." The term was in common use both as an adjective and as a noun, and indicated not only the ordinary pavement of the flagstone type, but also the finer, tessellated or mosaic varieties. Here it is used as the proper name of a particular place. To the natives, the place was Gabbatha, an Aramaic word of uncertain derivation, signifying possibly a "ridge," as of a hill, or simply an "elevation."

The Antonia was built by Herod the Great and named in honor of his patron Mark Antony. Previously, the Hasmoneans had a fortress or "Bîra" (*Baris* in Greek) on the same site. They had cut into the southern slope of Mt. Bezetha to form an immense platform, in the center of which they left standing a rectangular mass of rock about 350 feet long from east to west and about 125 feet wide. On this rocky mass, which rose on its southern side about 30 feet above the area, they put their fortress. Herod enlarged the platform, using the fill probably to cover the ravine between it and the northern courts of the temple. According to Josephus, he built a new palace-fortress of monumental proportions, quadrilateral in shape and having square towers at the corners. The southeastern tower, which dominated the temple enclosure, was more than a hundred feet high.

Until recently, the rocky mass still known as the Baris was thought to represent the extent of the Antonia. Explorations under the adjacent structures, however, by Fr. Vincent, O.P., and others, have revealed that the Antonia must have been about 450 feet long from east to west and about 325 feet wide. Upon the rock Baris was built the palace section. The ramparts and barracks were to the north of the palace and separated from it by a paved road.

At the western end of the Antonia was a spacious stone-paved courtyard, 178 feet long from north to south and 146 feet wide. Fortunately, much of it is still intact in the basement of the Convent of Notre Dame de Sion. The stones are unusually large for paving purposes. All are from 12 to 18 inches thick, and many of them are a yard square. They are laid alternately longer than wide or almost square, and still rest on their original bed of cement. Upon some of them are scratched mazes of lines and figures for games such as were played at the time by the Roman soldiers. At regular intervals are shallow gutters to provide drainage into the double reservoir below the courtyard. There are also fittings to support barriers, lights, etc.

A sixty foot road, paved with the same material but striated to prevent horses from slipping, enters the western double-bayed gate of the Antonia from the Tyropean Valley, crosses this courtyard, and continues eastward between the palace and the barracks. Most likely it continued out the eastern gate and down into the Cedron Valley. Although the Ecce Homo Arch, which is only a few feet from the site of the western gate, is a later construction, it may well represent the approximate spot where Pilate set up his *bema* in view of the people. May not then this courtyard be the Lithostrotos referred to by St. John? An increasing number of scholars are beginning to believe that it is. The only other plausible site would be the Palace of Herod on the western hill, but of that another time.

E. A. CERNY, S.S.

St. Mary's Seminary
Baltimore, Md.

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

Biblical Archaeologist, 4, 1941. H. Harvard Arnason, "The History of the Chalice of Antioch" (49-61). "The chalice was found, according to Eisen, in 1910 by Arabs digging a well at Antioch." In 1923 Eisen published a two-volume work on the Great Chalice of Antioch. Fr. Jerphanion writing in 1926 concluded that the chalice dates about 500 A.D. Later, viewing the chalice in 1931 and "having reviewed the whole question of the discovery, Jerphanion feels there is no reason whatsoever to doubt its authenticity."

Bibliotheca Sacra, 98, 1941. John F. Walvoord, "The Work of the Holy Spirit in Salvation" (285-306; 421-46). Continued from the April-June number.

E. F. Harrison, "Exegetical Studies in 1 Peter" (307-19; 459-68). Continued from the April-June number.

J. H. Bennetch, "The Apologetic Element in Scripture" (320-28).

W. W. Howard, "Is Faith Enough to Save?" (360-71; 489-501).

H. S. Curr, "The Intrinsic Credibility of Biblical Miracles" (469-78).

Clergy Review, 21, 1941. J. P. Arendzen, "Another Note on Matthew XIX, 3-12" (23-26). Disagrees with the interpretation of "incest" as the meaning of *porneia,* proposed by Frs. Dyson and Leeming in the April number. In Leviticus the LXX never uses *porneia* for incest, nor anywhere in the Greek Old Testament "as far as I know." As a solution the author proposes the following paraphrase for "excepta causa fornicationis": irrespective of the meaning you choose to give to *Ervath Dabar.*

Clergy Review, 22, 1942. G. D. Smith, "The Priesthood of the Laity" (1-11). The faithful are not priests in the strict sense because they are not mediators. Nevertheless mystically united with the divine Mediator, they are part of the Mystical Body, the corporate Mediator mediating between God and the unbaptized. The oblation of the laity in the Mass is not of itself properly sacrificial; it becomes integrated into the strictly sacerdotal function of the Church only through the proper priesthood of the ordained minister of Christ.

The Very Reverend Msgr. Barton remarks in reviewing a recent book, "Readers of the excellent introduction by Dom Roger Hudleston to his edition of the Rheims Version of 1582 in the 'Orchard Series' may . . . be reminded of the 2,803 passages 'in which the Rheims and Authorized Versions present readings that are either identical or strikingly similar, while they are different from those of all the earlier English versions,' and will conclude that to praise the Authorized Version is, in very many instances, to ackowledge the outstanding merits of its much pillaged source, the noble translation produced by the exiled professors at Rheims." (28-9).

Monsignor Barton also (30) has the following interesting notice: "Miss Beryl Smalley, a Catholic fellow of St. Hilda's College, Oxford, has written a really notable book on *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, a book which is itself a study of what is 'probably the most neglected aspect of medieval thought.' "

Ecclesiastical Review, 105, 1941. R. F. Stoll, "Publicans in the Gospels" (241-52).

F. Jos. Mutch, "Uncouth Words in New Version?" (421-2).

E. A. McNamara, "Because There Was No Room for Them in the Inn" (533-43). There "is no justification for attributing Joseph's inability to procure room in the public inn to a lack of kindness or hospitality on the part of Bethlehem's people, its innkeeper, or its travelers."

Ecclesiastical Review, 106, 1942. F. X. Peirce, S.J., "Scriptural Brevities from Foreign Periodicals" (63-70).

R. F. Stoll, "Our Lord's Farewell Discourses" (98-111). The first of a series of three articles. A commentary on chapter 14 of St. John.

Expository Times, 52, July 1941. C. J. Cadoux, "The Use of Hyperbole in Scripture" (378-81). "Biblical writers often made negative statements which were not meant to be taken at their face-value, but were simply intended to set in greater relief the accompanying affirmative assertions." A categorical clause could be used instead of a concessive, when the latter was really meant. Over-statements are found, such as the camel passing through the eye of a needle. "The habit of pronouncing an offense unpardonable . . . grew up as a normal way of pronouncing it utterly heinous."

W. A. Gould, "St. Paul and Nature" (392-4). A continuation of a previous article.

W. O. E. Oesterley, "Nazarene and Nazareth" (410-2). Suggests the following explanation for the prophecy, "He shall be called a Nazarene." Since Hebrew had two *z* sounds and was written without vowels, when words occurred "with the consonants *n, z, r,* there was a natural tendency to regard them as related, and as there is reason to believe that the Hebrew name of Nazareth was Nazara (hard *z*) . . . the Evangelist naturally concluded that the Old Testament words with the letters *n, z, r,* had a connexion with Nazara (Nazareth) and therefore with Jesus the Nazaraean (Nazarene)." Isaias spoke of the Messias as the branch (nezer), and Jeremias, though using a different word (zemach) had the same idea of the Messias as the branch.

On the history of the Nazarenes Oesterley says: Acts 24:5 shows that the Christians, called the Nazarenes, still belonged to the Jewish community about 60 A.D. On the other hand the curse of the Nozerim (Nazarenes) introduced into the Shemone 'Esreh about 80 A.D. indicates the Nazarenes by that time had been expelled from the Jewish community.

H. G. Meecham, "St. Mark X, 51 *ἵνα ἀναβλέψω.*" (437). *ἵνα* with the subjunctive of the first person may be a command, "Let me regain my sight" (Goodspeed).

E. Shillito, "A Section of the Gospel: the Gospel According to St. Luke XIV, 7-33" (432-4). Discusses the various items which deal with feasts among the Jews and with the feast of the Kingdom of God.

T. F. Glasson, "Jesus' Questions and Ours" (466-9). In the normal teaching of Jesus questions figured prominently. He used this method in order to make men think for themselves so that His truth became the natural growth of their own thought. He never gave men "carefully tabulated articles of belief" but his method of questioning aimed to make men "do their wrestling with reality. In this way he combined authority and private judgment." This method of instruction by questions is found in the discussions of our Lord in all four Gospels, and tells against the extreme Form Critics.

Expository Times, 53, 1941. F. J. Badcock, "Form Criticism" (16-20). Asserts that Form Criticism is based upon a false principle. "So far is it from being true that Christ's example and words were constantly quoted as the authority by which conduct was to be regulated and controversies determined, that the whole of the rest of the New Testament outside the Gospels would seem to show that knowledge of them was not in demand."

Allan Barr, "The Interpretation of the Parables" (20-25). Discusses the change in interpretation since the time of Jülicher. "From Jülicher's out-and-out condemnation of all allegorical elements in the original parables, there has been some reaction.... Provided that it does not interfere with the realism of the narrative or with its organic unity, a subordinate parabolic point may be admitted." In determining the true parables of Christ realism is invoked as a test. "Jesus was the greatest master of the art of the parable, and it is assumed that every parable of His was a picture drawn from life." The application of the parable was considered by Jülicher to be a moral or spiritual truth of a very broad and general kind. Recent interpreters seek a definite application and "make it their object to attach each parable to a concrete situation, known, conjectured, or imagined, in the intercourse of Jesus with followers or opponents, strangers or friends." Aiming at practical and not theoretical teaching, the parables cannot be expected to give us a systematic exposition of the central beliefs of our Lord.

J. S. MacArthur, "On the Significance of *ἡ γραφή* in 1 Timothy V, 18" (37). The verse is often cited to prove the late date of the letter on the score that Mt. is therein quoted as Scripture. Against this view the writer notes "that the passage in question comes from Q, which may well have been circulating with scriptural authority during the lifetime of St. Paul."

R. H. Lightfoot, "Form Criticism and Gospel Study" (51-4). An answer to Badcock's article in the October issue. "The work of Source Criticism, which has produced results of permanent value, is probably now upon the whole complete; and, rightly viewed, Form Criticism is the natural and indeed inevitable development of the earlier study." He points out divergences between Mk. 1:35-38 and its reproduction in Lk. 4:42 f to prove that Luke does not give what today would be called "plain history." The permanent value of Form Criticism is not the recovery of a "plain biography of Jesus," but the indication of the connexion between the little sections and the great fundamental, permanent Gospel themes.

Vincent Taylor, "Is it Possible to Write a Life of Christ?" (60-5). Form Criticism has put an end to the critical lives of Jesus. Nevertheless, disagreeing with the more radical claims of continental Form Critics, Taylor thinks that an attempt to tell the Life of Christ could be made, and points out some of the preliminary problems. "As always, every attempt to write a Life of Christ will be a failure; but with courage, faith, knowledge, and insight, the succession of failures will less deserve the name; each will point the way to something better."

R. O. P. Taylor, "The Accuser" (99-102). *Diabolus* originally meant accuser, a meaning found in Job and the Pastorals. In the temptation of Christ the suggestion to worship the Accuser meant "to choose denunciation and its attendant anger as His chief instrument."

Harvard Theological Review, 34, 1941. C. C. McCown, "Codex and Roll in the New Testament" (221-50). Proves that the codex was the likely form of the first New Testament writings, and draws conclusions regarding the various books. Of 50 Christian papyrus fragments dating before 200 A.D., 48 certainly formed part of codices. The Chester Beatty papyri of Numbers and Deuteronomy (28 leaves), written not later than 150 A.D., and the contemporary or earlier Edgerton papyri and the Rylands papyrus of John are all from codices. Martial refers to the use of codices in 85 A.D. The book form rather than the roll might explain possible dislocations in the fourth Gospel and the lost ending of Mark. McCown says the evidence supports the hypothesis that the Christian Scriptures in part were written in codices from the beginning, thus making possible a book of the Gospels and another of Paul's epistles.

Hibbert Journal, 40, 1941. E. L. Allen, "Suggestions for a Revised Christology" (65-74). Suggests the following. Jesus thinks of Himself as the man to whom God has revealed His ultimate secret and whom He has admitted into His most intimate presence. He is neither a human being promoted to divinity for his eminent piety nor a compound of divine and human natures, but a man in whose whole life-history God's purpose was worked out. The Jesus of history is the fact, the Christ of faith is the ultimate God-willed significance of that fact.

R. Travers Herford, "Repentance and Forgiveness in the Talmud. With some reference to the teaching of the Gospels" (55-64). Repentance, *Teshubah*, was a purely inward spiritual act, whatever form of expression may be found for it in outward act. No mediator could bear the guilt of a person to obtain forgiveness for him. Rabbinic sources speak of a sin which shall never be forgiven, meaning that it will be forgiven only with great difficulty.

W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, "The Silence of the New Testament" (82-91). Objections are brought against some Christian doctrines because they are not mentioned by our Lord or St. Paul or some other author. Lightfoot has shown the fallacy of the misused argument from silence in which "knows nothing of" frequently is equivalent to "says nothing of." The Church has the function of interpreting the silences of Scripture and of drawing inferences from its partial statements.

H. H. Rowley, "Sacrament and Sacrifice. I. A Protestant View of the Lord's Supper" (181-5). Disagreeing with both the Reformers and the Catholics, Professor Rowley suggests his interpretation which combines sacrifice and sacrament. "Whenever a man enters by faith into Christ, and makes the Cross the organ of his submission and obedience, then the unique and repeatable sacrifice of Christ is repeated for him. . ." "By the humble surrender of his spirit to Christ he becomes identified with Christ, so that what he offers to God is not his own humility, but the obedience of Christ, with whom he is now one by faith. While, therefore, it is our thesis that the sacrament is a sacrifice, it is a sacrifice that consists in no outward act."

Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. "Sacrament and Sacrifice. II. A Catholic View." (185-8). The union of sacrifice and sacrament are clear from 1 Cor. 11:24-26: "This is my body, which is in your behalf . . . as often as you eat and drink you proclaim the death of the Lord until he come." What Professor Rowley calls "a sacrifice that consists in no outward act" is required, but does not fulfill all that Christ intended by sacrifice. Fr. Lattey thus proposes his explanation. Christ's intercession in heaven consists essentially of the continued offering of His death upon Calvary, which is likewise represented mystically upon our altars. . . . Neither Christ nor man repeats the offering of Calvary, but continues it."

Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 41, 1940-1. F. Jos. Mutch, "The New Revision of the New Testament" (1221-3).

Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 42, 1941-2. F. Jos. Mutch, "Some Blemishes in the Revised New Testament" (11-7).

E. A. McNamara, "Considerations on Some Changes in the New Testament Revision" (122-32).

Hugh Pope, O.P., "The Biblical Translations of Dr. Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore" (313-26).

J. M. Vosté, O.P., "The Doxology of the Our Father" (368-9). The doxology was already in use at the time of the Didache, at the end of the first century. No critic today holds the words were an original part of the Lord's prayer.

M. J. Gruenthaner, S.J., "Antichrist in the Scriptures" (448-60). Considers the question whether Antichrist is an individual or a collective personality as has been recently proposed by Allo and Buzy. His conclusion is that "the so-called bugbear of an individual Antichrist has not been banned or relegated to a subordinate position as was thought in some quarters. His advent is certainly taught by St. Paul and probably predicted by Ezechiel. St. John recognizes it as an accepted part of early Christian teaching."

Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 58, 1941. Hugh Pope, O.P. "On Translating the New Testament: Some Suggestions" (110-22). Continues the July article.

Alfred O'Rahilly, "The Burial of Christ" (302-16). Continues an article in the August issue.

Journal of Bible and Religion, 9, 1941. P. S. Minear, "Is Biblical Research objective?" (217-22) Considers the charge of subjectivity brought against Biblical criticism.

W. J. Scarborough, "James the Just" (234-8). Examines the data in the New Testament and early Christian writings.

Jewish Quarterly Review, 31, 1941. Solomon Zeitlin, "The Crucifixion of Jesus Re-examined" (327-69). "The crucifixion itself and the *titulus* show quite clearly that Jesus was crucified by the Romans. It was only for the purpose of making more converts to Christianity that the Church Fathers accused the Jews of the crucifixion."

Jewish Quarterly Review, 32, 1941. Solomon Zeitlin, "The Crucifixion of Jesus Re-examined" (175-89). A continuation of the article in the April issue. "From the account given in the Acts on the trials of Peter and Stephen, we may surely conclude that, beside the Sanhedrin which tried religious offenders, there was also a Sanhedrin which was summoned by the head of the state to try people who committed offenses against the state."

Solomon Zeitlin, "The Crucifixion of Jesus Re-examined" (279-301). Claims that the Jews were not responsible for the death of Paul. "The only accusation which may be brought against the Jewish leaders who were responsible to the Roman authorities was that they delivered Paul to the Romans.... Even the delivery of Paul to the Romans was forced by political circumstances, since they were under the Roman yoke and were responsible to them for the political tranquillity of the country." "Neither Peter nor the Apostolic Fathers ever brought the charge against the Jews that they had crucified Jesus, but in a later period, when the policy of the early Christians was not to antagonize the Romans and even to make converts among them, the blame for the crucifixion was placed upon the Jews."

Journal of Biblical Literature, 60, 1941. Sir Robert Falconer, "1 Timothy 2, 14-15. Interpretative Notes" (375-9). The admonition that a woman must work out her salvation in faithful observance of married life is not Pauline. The writer has adopted a Hebrew maxim which he christianizes by adding, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety.

Kendrick Grobel, "He that Cometh After Me" (397-401). The author ventures the translation "There comes behind me one who is more capable than I." In other words, "There is a follower (disciple) of mine who is more capable than I." In that case the query from John in prison, "Art thou he that should come?" takes on verisimilitude, because it then no longer implies a retrogression in John's opinion of Jesus but a long leap forward.

Luitpold Wallach, "The Textual History of An Aramaic Proverb," Traces of the Ebionean Gospel (403-415). There was an Old-Jewish saying, "One should not hide one's light under the bushel." Under the influence of the proverbial phrase *eversores luminum canes* and the recollection of Matthew's account of Jesus riding on a donkey, *homar* (corn-measure, bushel) was humorously changed to *hamor* (ass). Therefore the "Aramaic proverb 'The ass came and overthrew the lamp' is a Jewish retort upon heretic Jewish-Christian doctrines." The Babylonian Talmud story of a fictitious dispute connected with the proverb represents a refutation of Ebionean criticism of Jewish Law and seems to indicate the existence of an Aramaic Matthew among the Ebionites.

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, I, 1942). A. T. Olmstead, "Could an Aramaic Gospel Be Written?" (41-75). Upholds the possibility showing that there were indications of Aramaic literature in the first century. Of dated Aramaic inscriptions "we can collect fifty dates from this same first century, and twenty-four of them are from the lifetime of Jesus." In Aramaic were written Josephus' Wars, the Book of Fasts (about 66), and a Targum of Job (about 50). Although thus vigorously disagreeing with Goodspeed, who thinks an Aramaic Gospel improbable, Olmstead does not adopt Torrey's theory entirely, since he believes that the present Gospels are not translations from the Aramaic.

Journal of Religion, 21, 1941. Henry J. Cadbury, "New Testament Study in the Next Generation" (412-20). "The actual course of development appears likely to be accidental rather than predictable." There is much yet to learn from Judaism, from its apocalypses, Josephus, and Philo. Semitic and especially Aramaic studies may be expected to yield some fruit. As a necessary condition for ripe scholarship, Professor Cadbury insists upon the need of a thorough grounding in the materials on which the new as well as the old science must be based. He suggests as a proper field for co-operation the early Christian writings. "We have no really satisfactory commentary on most of the post-canonical Christian writings, certainly none in English. Here is an inviting field for competent scholars singly or in groups."

Martin Dibelius, "The Text of Acts: An Urgent Critical Task" (421-31). Applies the *Formgeschichtliche* method to the text of Acts. Originally the small units circulated independently, and were later incorporated into the text. The earlier type of text shows clearly the seams between Luke's own work and the narratives which he incorporates. But the text of D has covered over these seams and shows editorial leveling, and for that reason represents a later stage of textual transmission. "Acts did not become a regular, ecclesiastical reading-book until . . . . the last third of the second century." Meanwhile its text was subject to changes, as can be seen from the Western text. Therefore Dibelius thinks that the Egyptian text as well should be scrutinized and conjectural improvements made for many impossible readings, since "the history of Acts before its acceptance into the New Testament entitles us to resort to such conjectures."

Journal of Religion, 22, 1942. Chester Charlton McCown, "Alfred Loisy—Unfaltering Critic" (20-38). Loisy "has hardly received in Germany, England and America the attention which he deserves." The influence of his life as a Catholic reappears in his later work when he insists upon the effect of the cult legend and of catechetical instruction in the formation of the New Testament. His defects as a scholar were an "undue pessimism as to the historical value of the Synoptic tradition" and an "almost unbounded" faith in his own critical acumen. With the latest phase of Gospel criticism his name is closely connected. "Hailed as the father of form history, he replied that he was not sure whether he was the father or the son, but that he believed in it."

Martin Rist, "Pseudepigraphic Refutations of Marcionism" (39-62). Discusses Tertullian's rule of faith in the Prescription of Heretics, the Didascalia, Epistle of the Apostles, III Corinthians, and the Pastorals. "Obviously the Pastorals . . . . are pseudepigraphic, written to controvert heresies contemporary with the time of their composition, using the name and prestige of the martyred apostle Paul." Many of the references seem directly aimed at Marcionism. "It may be objected that references such as these are too casual, too indefinite, to have been intended to form part of a refutation of Marcionism. But it should be noted that in a pseudepigraphic refutation such as the Pastorals appear to be, the less obvious the confutations are, the greater their effectiveness." The author concludes that 1 and 2 Timothy are directed against Marcionism.

Harold H. Hutson, "Some Factors in the Rise of Scientific New Testament Criticism" (589-95). Scientific "interpretation of the New Testament arose within the pale of the German university system. There the scientific method dominated the intellectual atmosphere, and there the conservative influence of the church was less potent than in other spheres. In this intellectual atmosphere the genius of a Strauss and a Baur could find expression."

Journal of Theological Studies, 42, 1941. Very Rev. Dr. J. Lowe, "An Examination of Attempts to Detect Developments in St. Paul's Theology" (129-42). The epistles furnish no evidence for a development in St. Paul's thought except in one minor point. In 1 Thess. Paul assumes he will be alive at the Parousia, whereas in Phil 1:21 ff he considers his death possible before that time, although in the same letter (4:5) he supposes that the end of all is close at hand. The recent theories of Knox and Dodd find no support in the epistles. Canon Knox believes that Paul's writings show a progressive adaptation of the Christian message to the intellect of the Gentile world. C. H. Dodd maintains that beginning with 2 Cor. one can detect a change from the early "futurist eschatology" to the later "realized eschatology" or "Christ-mysticism."

C. J. Cadoux, "The Imperatival Use of *ἵνα* in the New Testament" (165-73). By the first century A.D. in both vernacular and literary compositions the imperatival usage of *ἵνα* with the subjunctive was firmly established. In the New Testament there are four instances which are certain (Mk. 5:23; 2 Cor. 8:7; Eph. 5:33; Gal. 2:9 f) and a score of instances which are probable.

Harold A. Guy, "A Sayings-Collection in Mark's Gospel?" (173-6). Beginning with a suggestion from R. H. Lightfoot, Guy isolates words which are introduced by "Jesus said," or "Jesus says." He thus finds in Mark twenty-five sayings current in the Church as isolated pronouncements. These, he suggests, formed a collection as worthy as Q to be regarded as a genuine and authoritative document.

C. S. C. Williams, "Syriasms in the Washington Text of Mark" (177-8). Several instances (6:29; 6:35; 9:43; 10:11 f; 10:14) show the Syriac influence in this MS and consequently in the Caesarean text.

H. F. D. Sparks, "The Centurion's *παῖς*" (179-80) The meaning "son" is required by the Q original and Luke's servant is not so much an "interpretation" as a "misconstruction" of his source.

H. F. D. Sparks, "The Order of the Epistles in P 46" (180-1). The Chester Beatty papyrus order of Romans-Hebrews, 1, 2 Corinthians seems implied in the sequence of the quotations from Hieracas found in Epiphanius (Panarion 47, 2). The combination of the papyrus (probably early third century and from Fayum) and Hieracas (fourth century and living in the Delta) would indicate that the order Romans-Hebrews-Corinthians "was accepted by Egyptian Christians over a fairly extensive geographical area and over a considerable period of time."

G. D. Kilpatrick, "'Eπάνω Mark xiv, 5" (181-2). 'Eπάνω occurs only here in the Gospel and is omitted in a few but important codices. Hence the reading is doubtful. The insertion may be thus explained. During the first two centuries of our era the value of money greatly declined. A jar of ointment costing 300 denarii about A.D. 60 would cost about 500 denarii one hundred and twenty years later. The textual evidence suggests that *ἐπάνω* is a second century addition, and the depreciation of money would make some such word required for the sense. Subsequent depreciation of the money would make 300 denarii seem a trifle and cause *ἐπάνω* to be accepted in the majority of texts.

G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Disappearance of Q" (182-4). He suggests this hypothesis. At an early date Mark and Q were used over a large area, Q being anonymous, rather amorphous, and without a Passion narrative. Next, either Matthew or Luke was associated with these two documents, and Q, being superflous, dropped out of use, as Matthew and Luke embodied the substance of Q.

G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Possessive Pronouns in the New Testament" (184-6). In Mark and Luke only the predicative and pronominal uses are found; in Acts and Paul only the attributive; in Matthew and the Johannine writing, the predicative and pronominal and appositional. The latter use in John's Gospel is more frequent than the two other uses combined. The author then uses this data as a criterion for judging the authenticity of texts in Mark and Luke.

Matthew Black, "The Aramaic of *τόν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον* (Matt. vi, 11—Lk. xi, 3)" (187-9). He rejects A. Meyer's theory that *ἐπιούσιος* means "necessary, needful." The context shows the word refers to the coming day, an interpretation supported by the Memphitic version. The Gospel of the Hebrews read "the bread of tomorrow." Black proposes this Aramaic original: (lit.) give us today, tomorrow, our bread, i.e. give us today and every day our bread. The words "today, tomorrow," were translated *τόν ἐπιούσιον σήμερον.*

A. D. Doyle, S.J., "Pilate's Career and the Date of the Crucifixion" (190-3). The Jews, supported by the four sons of Herod, successfully appealed to Rome against Pilate's action in regard to the shields. Before October 31 when Tiberius' adviser, the anti-Semitic Sejanus, fell from power, such an appeal would be unlikely. Herod Antipas' part in the protest would account for the anger which Pilate had for him, as mentioned in the Gospel. If the shields incident precedes the Crucifixion, the latter must be placed in 33.

Revue de L'Université d'Ottawa, 12, 1942. Georges Simard, O.M.I., "La Querelle de Deux Saints" (15-38). St. Augustine had the better not only of the point in dispute but in the manner of disputing. Augustine's education helped him to overlook petty offences and his character was such that he could not be frightened by harsh language. On the other hand, when the controversy began, Jerome had already suffered much from his enemies and Augustine was not recognized as a famous name.

Theological Studies, 2, 1941. Laurence J. McGinley, S.J. "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives" (451-80). The first of seven studies which are the most complete contribution by any English or American Catholic scholar to this recent biblical problem.

J. Quasten, "The Conflict of Early Christianity with the Jewish Temple Worship. The Dependence of the Liturgy of Israel upon the Worship of the Gods of the Egyptians according to Theodoret and Chrysostom" (481-7).

Theological Studies, 3, 1942. Laurence J. McGinley, S.J. "Form Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives. II. Paradigm and Apothegm" (47-68). A continuation of the December article.

W. H. McClellan, S.J. "Monotheism and the Historical Process" 109-36). Reviews Professor Albright's "From Stone Age to Christianity."

R. V. Schoder, S.J. "Chrysostom and the Date of Christ's Nativity" (140-4). Concludes that the census was in December, the Nativity in March-April.

A. C. Wand, S.J. "The So-Called 'Cross' of Herculaneum" (144-5). Summarizes an article on that subject by Fr. G. de Jerphanion, S.J. in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 7 (1941) 5-35, who concludes the object was not a Christian cross.

ANTHONY C. COTTER, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Massachusetts

BIBLICAL NEWS

Septuagesima Sunday was selected by the Catholic Biblical Association of America as the permanent annual Biblical Sunday for this country. The announcement was made by the Very Reverend Thomas Plasmann, O.F.M., President of the Association.

In conjunction with the celebration of Biblical Sunday, the Association prepared some Sermon Outlines on the Sacred Scriptures and a List of Suggested Daily Lenten Readings from the Revised New Testament. The Outlines were published by the St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N. J., and the brochure was presented to the clergy of the United States and members of the Biblical Association with the compliments of the Association.

The proposed one-volume commentary, companion volume to the Revised New Testament is being prepared by the Editors for publication. The commentary will probably appear during the summer months.

New Recordings of the Sunday Gospels, following the Revised New Testament now being used widely in Catholic churches in the United States and Canada, were made by the Rev. P. J. O'Connor, assistant professor of sacred eloquence at the Catholic University. The object of the recordings is to make available to seminarians and to young priests desiring to improve their preaching technique a pattern of speech and expression that will serve them as a guide in the pulpit.

The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine has graciously released its copyright to the revised New Testament to permit its being used for Catholic men in the armed forces. Half a million copies of "My Daily Readings from the New Testament," arranged by the Rev. Joseph F. Stedman, have been printed by the United States government for free distribution to Catholic men in the service. The volume contains short readings for each day of the year, and harmonizes the complete life and teachings of Christ as related in the Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse. Each copy contains letters from President Roosevelt, and Monsignor William R. Arnold, army chief of chaplains.

A new translation of the Bible into Italian is being done under the auspices of the Pontifical Biblical Institute. The Rev. Albert Vaccari, S.J., rector of the Institute, will direct the work. The new translation will be published by the Salani Publishing house of Florence.

The Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.D., St. Mary's College, St. Mary's, Kansas, has been appointed professor of Sacred Scripture at the Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

The Rev. Dr. William H. Russell, assistant professor of religious instruction of the school of arts and sciences of the Catholic University, and author of *Christ our Leader*, has published a new book entitled, *Chats With Jesus*. The work is designed to bring the personal traits of our Lord to the attention of the students of religious education.

The Rev. Simon J. Carr, pastor of Our Lady of Consolation church, Parkersburg, Pa., observed the fiftieth jubilee of his ordination to the priesthood. Father Carr served as assistant professor of Semitic languages at the Catholic University of America in the 1890's.

The Rev. Adolphe Arthur Vaschalde, C.S.B., noted Oriental scholar, died in Toronto, Canada, in January. Father Vaschalde was professor of Oriental Languages at the Catholic University for many years. A few years ago he retired to work on an early Syriac translation of the Rule of St. Basil, but failing health had prevented his carrying the work very far.

His Excellency, the Most Reverend Joseph Schrembs, Archbishop-Bishop of Cleveland, has graciously invited the Association to hold its next general meeting in Cleveland. The Executive Board has tentatively selected September 1 and 2, 1942, as the dates of this meeting.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

VISUAL AIDS IN THE TEACHING OF SACRED SCRIPTURE

For some time the Visual Aids Committee of the Catholic Biblical Association of America has been working to establish in Washington, D. C., a library of slides of Bible lands and of objects of biblical interest such as monuments, inscriptions, documents, and coins. The slides, conveniently arranged and catalogued in various series for lecture purposes, are to be owned by the Association and placed at the disposal of its members free of charge, except for the payment of shipping expenses.

The first of the series of slide lectures is now available. The one hundred and forty-three slides (2″ x 2″) depicting the city of Jerusalem are arranged according to the following plan: 1-12, Topographical pictures; 13-64, Walls and Gates of the City; 65-95, Streets and Monuments; 96-143, Sights of the Passion and Death of Christ.

Other equipment useful for preparing and conducting the lecture: 1) An album of black and white prints corresponding to the pictures on the slides and arranged in the same order as the slides. This will permit the members to study the pictures and their titles before actually conducting their lecture. 2) A catalogue of the slides that may be conveniently placed on the lecture stand, enabling the speaker to know the sequence of the pictures. 3) A new Spencer projector with directions for its operation and care.

Those interested in obtaining this slide lecture should send notice well in advance of the date on which they wish to use it. Care should be taken to return the equipment in the same condition in which it was received, and to report any damage at once.

To facilitate the use of this as well as of all successive slide lectures, it is planned to furnish complete notes as soon as time permits.

Slides, album, catalogue, and projector, compactly fitted into a special container will all be sent upon application to:

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
Holy Name College, Department of Visual Aids
16th and Shepherd Sts. N.E.
Washington, D. C.

FIFTH GENERAL MEETING OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION

The annual meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America under the patronage of His Eminence Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia, was held at Philadelphia, Pa., November 15 and 16, 1941. The Association made its headquarters at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel.

The Association was honored by the presence of the Most Reverend Ralph L. Hayes, D.D., Rector, North American College, Rome, and the Most Reverend Constantine Bohachevsky, D.D., Bishop of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Diocese, Philadelphia, both of whom presided over the deliberations of the Association; it was likewise honored by the presence of the Most Reverend Edwin O'Hara, D.D., Bishop of Kansas City, Chairman of the Episcopal Committee, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, the Most Reverend John G. Murray, S.T.D., Archbishop of St. Paul, the Most Reverend Charles D. White, Bishop of Spokane, and the Most Reverend Anthony Schuler, S.J., Bishop of El Paso.

The Fifth General Meeting was the best attended in the history of the Association. Besides those who registered and whose names are listed below the Association was honored by the presence of guests from the clergy.

The following members were present:

Arbez, Edward P., S.S.
Washington, D. C.
Bandas, Rudolph G.
St. Paul, Minn.
Barry, W. T., C.SS.R.
Esopus, N. Y.
Bierberg, R., C.PP.S.
Washington, D. C.
Brunet, Achille, S.J.
Montreal, Can.
Byrne, Edward J.
Rochester, N. Y.
Callan, Charles J., O.P.
Hawthorne, N. Y.
Cerny, Edward A., S.S.
Baltimore, Md.
Christopher, J. S.
Darlington, N. J.
Coleran, James E., S.J.
Weston, Mass.
Collins, John J., S.J.
Weston, Mass.
Considine, J. S., O.P.
River Forest, Ill.

Costello, C. J., O.M.I.
Washington, D. C.
Cummins, P., O.S.B.
Conception, Mo.
DeGuglielmo, A., O.F.M.
Lowell, Mass.
DeVine, C. F., C.SS.R.
Woodstock, Canada
Donovan, V. J., C.P.
Washington, D. C.
Donzé, E. H., S.M.,
Washington, D. C.
Dougherty, John J.
Darlington, N. J.
Duffy, Walter, O.M.C.
Rensselear, N. Y.
Folliard, Cyprian, C.P.
Washington, D. C.
Foerster, R. J. L., C.P.
Union City, N. J.
Galus, Walter J., C.R.
Washington, D. C.
Gaul, Cyril, O.S.B.
St. Meinrad, Ind.

Gruenthaner, M., S.J.
St. Mary's, Kans.
Hanley, John C.,
Trenton, Ont., Can.
Hartdegen, S., O.F.M.
Washington, D. C.
Hartman, L., C.SS.R.
Esopus, N. Y.
Heenan, John J., S.J.
Philadelphia, Pa.
Heupler, C., O.F.M.Cap.
Westerville, Ohio
Hodous, Edward, S.J.
West Baden, Ind.
Kennedy, Mark, O.F.M.
Washington, D. C.
Koch, Rt. Rev. Alfred
Latrobe, Pa.
Kugelman, R., C.P.
Union City, N. J.
Louis, Conrad, O.S.B.
Washington, D. C.
LeHoullier, A., O.M.I.
So. Natick, Mass.

McClellan, W. H., S.J.
Woodstock, Md.
McConnell, John, M.M.
Maryknoll, N. Y.
McEvoy, John A., S.J.
Weston, Mass.
McGinley, L. J., S.J.
Woodstock, Md.
McGlinchey, J., C.M.
Northampton, Pa.
McGlynn, F., C.S.Sp.
Norwalk, Conn.
McHugh, John A., O.P.
Hawthorne, N. Y.
McKenzie, John L., S.J.
Weston, Mass.
Mallon, Vincent, M.M.
Clarks Summit, Pa.
McNamara, Elmer
Rochester, N. Y.
Mangan, E. A., C.SS.R.
Oconomowoc, Wisc.
Martin, L. W., C.M.
Washington, D. C.
Murphy, Richard, O.P.
Washington, D. C.
Newton, William L.
Cleveland, Ohio
O'Donnell, J.
Emmitsburg, Md.
Peters, Edward, C.S.P.
Washington, D. C.
Pickar, Charles, O.S.A.
Washington, D. C.
Plassmann, T., O.F.M.
St. Bonaventure, N.Y.
Poirier, L., O.F.M.
Montreal, Canada
Poulet, Donat, O.M.I.
Ottawa, Canada
Przezdziecki, Joseph J.
Darlington, N. J.
Reilly, Wendell S., S.S.
Baltimore, Md.
Rooney, Gerard, C.P.
Jamaica, L. I., N. Y.
Rowan, John F.
Philadelphia, Pa.
Seraphin, E., O.F.M.
Croghan, N. Y.
Siegman, E., C.PP.S.
Carthagena, Ohio
Skehan, Patrick W.
Washington, D. C.
Sloane, Charles O.
Yonkers, N. Y.
Smith, Eustace J.
St. Bonaventure, N.Y.
Smyth, K., O.F.M.Cap.
Marathon, Wis.
Stapleton, Matthew P.
Brighton, Mass.
Steinmueller, John E.
Huntington, N. Y.
Tennant, Joseph
Huntington, N. Y.
Weisengoff, J. P.
Washington, D. C.
Yungfleisch, S., C.P.
W. Springfield, Mass.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15

10:00 A.M. The morning session was called to order by the President, Rev. Edward J. Byrne, S.T.D., who congratulated the assembled members who had made such sacrifice of time and money to insure the success of the Fifth General Meeting of the Association.

Presiding: The Most Reverend Ralph L. Hayes, D.D., Rector, The North American College, Rome; *The Place of the Sacred Scriptures in Ecclesiastical Studies,* a discussion led by Rev. John P. Weisengoff, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

The speaker presented a brief though comprehensive epitome of the theoretical place of Sacred Scripture in the seminary. He touched upon Sacred Scripture as a source of revealed doctrine; Sacred Scripture in the theological formation of the Fathers; the papal pronouncements on the importance of Sacred Scripture in the theological formation of priests. The speaker deplored the fact that, for some reason, the prevailing method of imparting theological knowledge apparently fails to inoculate men with the spirit of the Sacred Scriptures. Doctor Weisengoff provoked lively discussion when treating of the importance accorded Sacred Scripture in the seminary course. A very spirited discussion centered about the question: "Have we over-emphasized reason and de-emphasized Sacred Scripture?" A prime requisite, as all agreed, for reinstating Sacred Scripture into its rightful place is the proper training of theologians in the sacred text. The speaker suggested that the speculative theology course be divorced from that of positive theology; the one to be supervised by a philosopher of theology, the other by a trained scripturist; furthermore, that the hours now devoted to theology be divided between the two courses. Time did not permit the discussion of the method of treating biblical theology. A digest of this discussion was given in the Quarterly for January, 1941.

2:00 P. M. The New Testament in Our Colleges by Rev. Eustace Smith, O.F.M., St. Bonaventure's Seminary, St. Bonaventure, N. Y. In the absence of the Most Reverend Daniel P. Desmond, D.D., Bishop of Alexandria, who was to preside over the session, the second session was opened with prayer by Rev. Edward J. Byrne, President of the Association. Rev. Eustace Smith, O.F.M., emphatically recommended the historical approach as the best means to impart to students the message of the New Testament. The prepared discussion that followed under the direction of Rev. Edward A. Mangan, C.SS.R., Immaculate Conception Seminary, Oconomowoc, Wisc., brought to light the woeful lack of biblical knowledge among our Catholic college students. Application of the method suggested by Rev. Eustace Smith, O.F.M., will definitely improve the situation.

Demonstration of Visual Aids in the Teaching of Scripture by Rev. John J. Dougherty, Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, N. J. This proved to be an interesting and welcome message to the assembled members; the slides shown as well as the accompanying lecture were prepared by the speaker and donated to the Visual Aid Department established by the Association. This first series of slides and a catalogue of the titles are ready for distribution among the members of the Association. Father Dougherty reported on the work of the Committee on Visual Aids, outlined the plans for the future, and demonstrated the practicality of visual aids in the classroom. This service of the Association is gratis to the members.

4:30 P.M. Business Meeting. The Rev. Edward H. Donzé, S.M., General Secretary, reported that the Association has now been incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia through the generous services of Caesar L. Aiello, Esq. The observance of Biblical Sunday was suggested to the American Hierarchy through the officers of the Association. The revised New Testament has become the accepted text in the United States of America. Membership roll of the Association now numbers 671.

The General Secretary commented the efforts made by William H. Sadlier, New York, to increase the number of the members.

The Rev. John E. Steinmueller, Treasurer, reported the year's receipts as $6,720.51. The year's expenses were $2,386.96. Including a special gift presented this day through Bishop O'Hara, there was on hand a balance of $19,470.17.

After this very favorable report of the Treasurer, the Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, D.D., Bishop of Kansas City, Chairman of the Episcopal Committee, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, informed the Association that sufficient paper had been bought to guarantee the immediate needs of the projected publications now being prepared by the members of the Association for the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. The check for $10,000 which the Bishop so graciously turned over to the Association was a donation made by the Rev. Joseph T. Stedman, Director of the Confraternity of the Precious Blood, Brooklyn, N. Y., for furthering promotion of the study and the spread of the Scriptures. A rising vote of thanks was tendered to Father Stedman.

The following were elected active members of the Association upon recommendation of the membership committee:

Rev. Rudolph Bierberg, C.PP.S.
Rev. Achille Brunet, S.J.
Rev. Joseph P. Christopher, Ph.D.
Rev. Victor Donovan, C.P.
Rev. Yves M. Faribault, O.P.
Rev. Cyprian Folliard, C.P.
Rev. James Holland
Rev. Ronald Kunz, C.P.
Rev. Bernard LeFrois, S.V.D.
Rev. Adrien M. Malo, O.F.M.
Rev. Daniel W. Martin, C.M.
Rev. John A. McEvoy, S.J.
Rev. John L. McKenzie, S.J.
Rev. Donal J. O'Herlihy, S.S.L.
Rev. Eberhard Olinger, O.S.B.
Rev. Joseph J. Przezdziecki
Rev. Gerard Rooney, C.P.

Report on the English Bible. Msgr. Newton then informed the members of the manner in which the distribution of the revised New Testament was accomplished. To date 450,000 copies of the revised text have been distributed: 100,000 remain on hand. In the distribution of the text the Holy Name Society had the active co-operation of sixty-four bishops of the Hierarchy. In dioceses where the text has not been introduced, local circumstances have hindered the immediate circulation of the text.

The functions of the temporary National New Testament Committee ceased on Nov. 1, 1941. The work of distribution is being carried on by the newly established office of Confraternity Publications, 144 West 32d Street, New York City.

The Sunday Epistles and Gospels Book was edited by Msgr. Newton and Rev. Steinmueller; Msgr. William L. Newton supplied the notes on the Epistles; Rev. John E. Steinmueller, the notes on the Gospels.

First printing of Gospels and Epistles Book:		15,000	
	Copies sold	14,300	
Second printing in press		7,500	
Royalties received	approximately	$3,000	(November 15)

The text is used in approximately 60% of the parishes in the U. S. It has been introduced by many priests in Canada and by some in England.

The Revision Committee and the Editorial Board for the New Testament, upon the completion of their work, automatically disbanded. Most of the members are reappointed for the revision of the Old Testament. This appointment comes in each instance from the Episcopal Committee on the Confraternity.

In place of the New Testament Revision Committee now stands the permanent New Testament Committee of the Catholic Biblical Association, which will consider all suggestions for further change of the text.

One obligation of the Association remains in this connection: to take care of the expenses of the Revision Committee and the Editorial Board. Until the present no funds were available; however, with funds now available, their expenses will be paid.

In conclusion Msgr. Newton extended his sincerest thanks to all who co-operated on the revision of the New Testament: revisers, editors, critics; to all the members who in many ways made this memorable work possible.

Report of the Committee on Scientific Commentaries. The following resolutions are the result of deliberations of the Committee on Scientific commentaries submitted by Msgr. Newton and recommended for adoption by the Catholic Biblical Association.

1. The preparation of scientific commentaries is a proper and fitting function of the Catholic Biblical Association; furthermore, the Association is in a position to promote such work.

2. This promotion has two aspects:

A) A program for encouraging the members to prepare thorough scientific studies of the various books of the Bible. The actual means of accomplishing this should be left to the committee designated for the work by the Association. No new office of the Association need be created for this purpose; the functions of this committee could be given to the Editorial Board.

Assignment of the books to particular authors need not be made formally. Priority for each book might be arranged by asking the active members to indicate their willingness to enter upon the project. Those who have acted as revisers for the various books might be in the best position to undertake further study of the books they have been working on, though this might not be true in all cases. If more than one were interested in a book, collaboration might be effected. No question of time is insinuated into this promotion. Thoroughness and not speed is the first consideration. The C.B.A. should aid the authors in every way possible, even to the extent of financial assistance.

B) The second aspect of the promotion is one in which the C.B.A. as an organization can be most helpful: the preparation of a market and the actual distribution of the series.

The manner in which this is to be accomplished will rest with the proper agency selected by the Association. This would also include the questions of printer, royalties, etc.

The Committee on Scientific Commentaries recommends that this whole program be made one of the prime functions of the existing Editorial Board of the Association.

After some discussion the members approved of this report of the Committee and empowered it to proceed with its recommendations.

Report of the Committee on Visual Aids. The report of this Committee was presented by Rev. Stephen J. Hartdegen, O.F.M. The Committee decided on the establishment of a lending library whereby the slides of the individual members and of the Association might be interchanged. Rev. John J. Dougherty has begun a series of slides of Judea; Rev. John E. Steinmueller, a series on Transjordania; Rev. Stephen J. Hartdegen, a series of slides on Samaria and Galilee. These three series of slides together with lectures and catalogues are to be placed at the disposal of the members of the Association. The headquarters for the library of slides procured by the Association will be in Washington, D. C. In order that the Committee may continue its work the Association set aside $300.00 for its use.

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly. The Rev. Wendell S. Reilly, S.S., Editor-in-Chief, asked for contributions to maintain the high standard of work that has marked the publication of the Quarterly. He urged efforts for its wider circulation. As an inducement and a recompense to writers the Association resolved that a honorarium be paid for all articles accepted for publication.

A suggestion was made that a new section "Brief Communications" be introduced into the Quarterly.

In connection with the literary work done in behalf of the Association, the members gave a rising vote of thanks to Msgr. Newton and Dr. Steinmueller for their work in editing the Sunday Epistle and Gospel Book.

The Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara informed the Association of the interest and desire of the Episcopal Committee to see the popular commentary on the New Testament an accomplished fact. The distribution will be taken care of by the Episcopal Committee; no financial obligations will fall upon the Association.

The suggestion to make Biblical Sunday a yearly event met with the approval of Bishop O'Hara. He vouched for the good will of the Hierarchy in the event that the Association would go on record for the yearly observance of Biblical Sunday. The Association then empowered the Executive Committee to proceed with the suggestions made.

Bishop O'Hara further informed the Association that no immediate revision of the revised New Testament is contemplated. The Episcopal Committee is ready to lend its prestige and aid to the revision of the Old Testament. The text of the revision will be given to any publisher who can make some contribution toward popularizing the text in a literary manner, e.g., by the publication of missals, a harmony of the Gospels, etc.

Bishop O'Hara had the warmest praise for the excellent co-operation and assistance lent to the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine by the St. Anthony Guild Press.

Constitution and By-Laws. The following revisions of the Constitution were voted and accepted by the Association:

1. Article IV, was amended to read:

Life Members: Persons who contribute $100 to support of the Association.

2. Article VII, Section I, was amended to read:

The Association shall be governed by an Executive Board composed of a President, a Vice-President, two Consultors, a General Secretary, a Recording Secretary, a Treasurer, and not more than six others, specified in the By-Laws. The officers here named shall be elected yearly at the general meetings, except the Consultors, who shall be appointed by the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine for a term of two years. The President and the Vice-President shall be ineligible for immediate re-election to their respective offices.

The following additions were made to the By-Laws:

1. The publication of THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL QUARTERLY shall be in the care of an Editorial Board consisting of eight members, two of whom shall be elected by the Association at each annual meeting to serve for four years. Of these eight members one shall be editor-in-chief to direct the composition of the Quarterly and one a publishing editor to supervise the printing. Both the editor-in-chief and the publishing editor shall be members of the Executive Board of the Association.

2. Funds of the Association may be expended by the Treasurer for expenses under one hundred dollars. Between general meetings of the Association the President, General Secretary, and Treasurer together by unanimous vote may expend funds up to the amount of five hundred dollars. For the expenditure of higher sums, in cases of emergency between general meetings of the Association, the General Secretary

shall submit a resolution to the Executive Board: the expenditures as stated in the resolution may be made provided, it is approved by two-thirds of those of the Executive Board whose votes are received within fifteen days after the resolution is mailed.

3. The Association shall sponsor a biblical section at national and regional congresses of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

4. There shall be a Committee on Membership, consisting of four members appointed by the President with the approval of the Executive Board. Each year one member of the committee shall be appointed for a period of four years. This committee shall invite members to the Association and solicit subscriptions to the Catholic Biblical Quarterly. The committee shall elect its chairman, who shall be a member of the Executive Board.

5. By-Law 7c was amended to read "Commtitee on Credentials" for "Committee on Membership."

6. There shall be a committee on Scientific Commentaries, consisting of five members, for the promotion of a series of scientific commentaries on the books of the Old and the New Testament. It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct all arrangements involved in the preparation and distribution of this series.

Because of unforeseen circumstances and the lack of time the report of the nominating committee was postponed until Sunday, Nov. 16.

8:00 P.M. Meeting of the Board of Revisers of the Old Testament. Rev. Patrick W. Skehan reported on the progress of the revision of the Old Testament. To date about 30% of the work of the revisions had been forwarded to the Editorial Board: the prospects are that the remainder will soon be in the hands of the Editorial Board. The meeting was very informal; its purpose was to give the Revisers some idea of the difficulties encountered in the work of revision and to request practical suggestions for handling problems common to a number of books in the Old Testament.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 16

10:30 A.M. His Eminence Dennis Cardinal Dougherty officiated at the Solemn Pontifical Mass celebrated at Convention Hall. The sermon for the occasion was delivered by His Excellency, the Most Rev. Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, D.D., Apostolic Delegate to the United States. The Rev. James A. Boylan, D.D., directed the choir of St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Philadelphia, Pa.

2:00 P.M. The first business on hand was the report of the Committee on Nominations, presented by Rev. Patrick Cummins, O.S.B. The following were elected by the members of the Association:

Officers

President	Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., Ph.D., S.T.D., Lect. Gen. in S.S.
Vice President	John F. Rowan, S.T.D., S.S.L.
General Secretary	Edward H. Donzé, S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Recording Secretary . . .	John J. Dougherty, S.T.L., S.S.L.
Treasurer	John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.S.L.

Editorial Board of the Catholic Biblical Quarterly

For four years: Wendell S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D., and William L. Newton, M.A., S.S.D.

For three years: William H. McClellan, S.J., M.A., S.T.D., and Edward H. Donzé, S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

For two years: Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.D., and John P. Weisengoff, M.A., S.T.D., S.S.L.

For one year: Anthony C. Cotter, S.J., S.T.D., and Cyril Gaul, O.S.B., M.A.

Committee on Nominations

J. S. Considine, O.P., S.T.Lr., Chairman
Louis Hartman, C.SS.R., S.S.L., Ling.Or.L.
Richard J. Dobell, M.A.
Kevin Smyth, O.F.M.Cap., S.T.D., S.S.L.

Committee on Scientific Commentaries

Edward H. Donzé, S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L., Chairman
Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Richard J. Dobell, M.A.
Matthew P. Stapelton, S.T.D., S.S.L.
J. S. Considine, O.P., S.T.Lr.

Committee on One-Volume Commentary

William L. Newton, M.A., S.S.D., Chairman
Wendell S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.
Charles H. Pickar, O.S.A., S.T.L., S.S.L
Edward H. Donzé, S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Louis Hartman, C.SS.R., S.S.L., Ling.Or.L.

Committee on New Testament Expenses

John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.S.L., Chairman
William L. Newton, M.A., S.S.D.
John J. Dougherty, S.T.L., S.S.L.

The Revised New Testament. Discussion Leader: Rt. Rev. Msgr. William L. Newton, Our Lady of the Lake Seminary, Cleveland, Ohio.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Newton prefaced this discussion by a brief review of the history of the revised text of the New Testament. The revision of the Challoner-Douay New Testament was undertaken by some twenty revisers, supplemented by eight or ten members of the Editorial Board. Eventually about fifty scholars participated in completing the revision.

The publication of St. John's Gospel served as an exemplar for the revision; the constructive criticism resulting from this trial publication greatly aided the Editorial Board in formulating its final rules and plans for the publication of the New Testament. The actual work, then, of the revision must be accredited to the Association. The Association proposes to make this revision as perfect as possible; hence, a responsibility still rests with the Association. Work that may remain to be done with the revision has been limited by the authority of the Episcopal Committee; however, necessary corrections, when found, will be made in the text.

Only twenty letters of appreciation and criticism have reached the Secretary of the Editorial Board; one of these came from a non-Catholic source. Owing to the method of distribution the reaction of non-Catholic scholars has of necessity been slow. The criticism received and advanced orally may be classified under two headings: 1) General criticism which for the most part is favorable; 2) Detailed criticism, both of the destructive and constructive type.

GENERAL CRITICISM

1) Criticism which emanates from the older clergy; this opposition is inspired by the reverence which individuals have invested in the old text. This sincere opposition will gradually cease.

2) Criticism coming from incompetent sources; this can be disregarded by the Association.

3) Criticism proceeding from publishing houses who have large investments in copies of the unrevised text. Significantly, however, the sale of the Challoner Bible has been augmented due to the renewed interest in the Sacred Text.

DETAILED CRITICISM

1) The style of the New Testament revision lacks consistency; some objection has been taken to the method of enclosing quotations within quotations.

2) Departure from consecrated wording of the Challoner Bible, e.g., Holy Spirit, denarius, etc. These types of criticism may be disregarded since the reason for the changes in the revision rest on excellent authority.

3) The type of criticism to be given consideration. a) Constructive criticism which deals with a better rendering of the text. Such is the suggestion of Father Powers, S.J., Australia, for the translation of Phil. 2:4. b) Criticism of the type submitted by Msgr. Bar-

ton in the *Clergy Review;* in this particular article, however, Msgr. Barton goes beyond the principles of the present revision.

At this point the President, Rev. Edward J. Byrne, asked for the observations of the members on the revision.

The Association agreed that criticism coming from its members should be subjected to the special committee rather than be aired in publications. Questions regarding format and the principles of the revision were thoroughly reviewed. One interesting discussion centered about the question of paraphrasing a passage and the interpretation of an Aramaic idiom translated into the Greek or Latin Text. This problem is of particular interest, since the principles of revision definitely excluded paraphrasing.

At the conclusion of the discussion Msgr. Newton, as Secretary of the Board of Revision, thanked the revisers for the humble tolerance with which they accepted the changes introduced in their MSS by the Editorial Board; furthermore, he expressed his sincerest gratitude to all the revisers and the members of the Editorial Board for their interest and help in bringing the undertaking to such a successful issue.

President's Address. Rev. Edward J. Byrne, St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y. Owing to the lack of time Rev. Edward J. Byrne confined himself to a few remarks from the formal address prepared for the occasion. The seriousness of the present world situation impresses upon us an all-out effort to save the world for Christ. In Europe biblical publications have ceased or been greatly curtailed; the work, however, must go on. Hence, the opportunities as well as the obligations of scholars in America. True, the difficulties in Europe have resulted in a religious revival; but, where outside of Catholic publications can individuals find the conviction and strength to bear up under present day conditions! Our contribution to religion, the revised New Testament, contains indeed the imperfections of a translation. These we must offset by insisting upon general and special studies of introduction; in particular, let historical criticism come into its proper place in the study of the sacred text. Present the historical Christ and His message to the world. In conclusion Rev. Edward J. Byrne expressed his appreciation and thanks for the co-operation of the Society's officers and members.

The newly elected President, Rev. Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., thanked the retiring President for his guidance of the Association during the past year. The concluding prayer by the Most Reverend Constantine Bohachevsky, D.D., Bishop of Ukrainian Greek Catholic Diocese, Philadelphia, brought the fifth general meeting of the Association to a close.

CHARLES G. HEUPLER, O.F.M.,CAP.
Recording Secretary.

BOOK REVIEWS

William J. McGarry, S.J., *He Cometh* (New York: The America Press, 1941). Pp. VII, 332. $3.50.

Though Father McGarry died suddenly September 23, 1941, the genius and warmth of his spirit still breathes in this posthumous work. This volume was selected by the Spiritual Book Associates as its selection for November, 1941. The content is divided into six parts: the Spirit of Advent; the Land of Advent; the People of Advent; the Prophet, the Precursor, and the Patriarch of Advent; the Lady of the Advent; the Lord King of the Advent. As one can observe, hardly a phase of Advent is not touched upon. In the words of the author, "this book attempts to present devotional reflections on the Advent liturgy for the purpose of increasing our union with the Lord King who comes"; that task has been accomplished. Very few books can so well guide the layman or even the priest through the liturgy of Advent as found in the official prayers of the Church. The liturgical movement has gained tremendously by the publication of this volume; even those with anti-liturgical leanings will regard the book as a kind of revelation; they will finish reading the volume with a prayer that the present contribution may be the beginning of a new era in liturgical publications.

Father McGarry makes the liturgy live; he shows us the scriptural and doctrinal content which inspire the liturgy. From the scriptural point of view he reviews the background, geographical and historical, where the scene of action takes place; he considers the climate and vegetation, the customs and people upon which the liturgy imposes a symbolic sense; he gives us the connotation and meaning of the metaphors which deal with the products of the land. It is the scholar's knowledge of Sacred Scripture that gives this book its special significance.

The fourth and fifth parts of the book deal with simple and inspiring pen pictures of the prophet Isaias, St. John the Baptist, St. Joseph, St. Elizabeth and Our Lady. In the author's opinion St. Joseph's deliberations before taking the Blessed Virgin as his wife do not appear to question the integrity of Our Lady; "yet—could any man dare to take as wife one thus raised to a plane of existence where mere men do not tread?"

In the fifth chapter of the book the various senses of Sacred Scripture are mentioned and special consideration is given to the accommodated sense, so frequently employed by the liturgy. The rules governing the accommodated sense should be read and noted by all who are interested in the Word of God. The book is popular in tone; it is intended for all who would make of Advent a season in which to bring Christ and the mystery of the Incarnation vividly into their meditations and prayers.

Charles G. Heupler, O.F.M.Cap.

REV. SIMON YUNGFLEISCH, C.P., *A Scientific Hebrew Grammar for Beginners*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1941. Pp. xii, 141. $2.50.

Under the increasing pressure of modern standards on the seminary curriculum, the Hebrew course, always exposed to attrition, bids fair to suffer more than ever. In some institutions the student is barely given time enough for his Hebrew "to see what it is like" (in a phrase too familiar), and to resolve to shun it ever afterward as either above his reach or beneath his notice. Even under better conditions, the most that the average man may hope for is to acquire enough coordinated knowledge of form and syntax for intelligent reference to the Old Testament—which, after all, is the whole of ancient Hebrew literature, and the only reason for studying the language at all.

A strictly inductive method, consisting mainly of progressive themes for composition, would squander the allotted hours to little purpose. Without erring at the opposite extreme of a too exclusively synoptic method, the seminarian's textbook must be a systematic grammar complete in all essentials. He is of an age to need an outline of the whole field, with all its parts in due relation, and his memory needs the aid of logical connection. Even with such a text at hand—such a manual, say, as that of H. G. Mitchell, or the first section of Touzard, or an English translation of Strack—it will still be the teacher's problem to adapt this guide to the limits of the local curriculum. But for beginners, in any case, the "what" must come before the "why," and the latter curtailed rather than the former.

This, at least, is what common experience has hitherto commended. The question is whether this method of first approach to Hebrew can be improved upon. Quite another method is inaugurated in the little volume before us. So far as we know, Father Yungfleisch gives us the first thing of its kind to appear in print. He goes behind the classical Hebrew of the Old Testament to its inferred prototypes, as exhibiting the ulterior laws which survive in and partly govern the inflections of the literary dialect itself. Such a treatment is justly termed scientfic; but in the present compass it is science in outline only. It might be likened to a typical body of notes delivered to advanced students at St. Etienne or the Biblical Institute, and thrown into a more consecutive style; or, from another angle, to a brief abstract of the advanced section of Touzard. Whereas the student has been wont to begin with a groundform extant in biblical Hebrew, and to learn to follow its modifications through the inflective process with a practical account of their controlling rules, it is now proposed to conduct him behind the groundform itself into the seed-plot of its own evolution, apparently in the hope of giving to his further studies a more extended perspective.

This is just such knowledge as a teacher welcomes for his own fuller and truer orientation. Its background keeps his ideas in objective balance, and stabilizes his statements of such ulterior laws of morphology as he may deem helpful to his pupils. But when it comes to taking a preliminary view of the whole complex of *gemeinsemitisch* prototypes (themselves, by the way, the creations of induction), can this be fairly asked of beginners in the most exotic and unfamiliar language they have ever encountered? We put the question thus directly because it is the whole question of this manual's practical value. As designed for the use of beginners, it is in effect a challenge to conventional methods and a plea for their abandonment, and as such it must be impartially judged. If Father Yungfleisch's method is practicable, he has presented it here with judgment and breadth of view, and in rather attractive form. But, facing the problem of facts, we doubt if the average seminarian would really benefit by initiation into mysteries lying behind the Hebrew of the Old Testament, as an introduction to those which it comprises in itself, or that he could more easily solve the latter in the light of the former.

About the execution of the work in general, there is nothing superficial or hasty, and much evidence of sound scholarship. The latter is unconsciously reflected in the tastefulness and precision of translations *passim;* they are the work of one to whom the language speaks. Typography is kept so uniform that the page at first glance encourages the reader. But the simplifying process exacts its price. Not at all uncommon is a paragraph of ten or more lines consisting of a single sentence, and therefore choked with distracting parentheses and superinduced commas. To the same general tendency may be due the insufficiency of some rules, such as the account of furtive *pathaḥ*. Other principles seem to be stated from an oblique point of approach, as where the first three rules for methegh make it "indicate that a vowel is long" in three respective positions where it could not be otherwise, while the one essential character of methegh—that it indicates a secondary tone—is not even mentioned. The cases in which a final vowel causes or fails to cause the aspiration of an initial mute in the following word are far from fully accounted for. There are a number of general rules which seem to suffer from defects of this order. Into matters of dispute between good authorities (such as the intermediate syllable) we do not wish to enter here.

Most grammarians in their arrangement of the matter, realizing that the verb is the heart of the language, give it first place in morphology after exhibiting the pronoun because of its place in verbal inflection. Father Yungfleisch prefers to begin with the noun; but we fear that his treatment of it pre-empts for its display of inferential origins the very space that should be given to actual issues. After the various theoretical types of an earlier noun have been exhibited and then traced to their descendant groups in biblical Hebrew, we find all of the latter duly tabulated in the dozen forms sufficient to account for gender, number and state. But the further inflection by pronominal suffixes is not even exemplified in a single type, the rules of its development being deemed enough. Another omission is truly surprising: the three types of the segholate noun, numerous as they are, are neither mentioned as a class nor exemplified in a single groundform, nor is the inferred source of their origin evident among the preliminary forms enumerated.

There is not only no verb-paradigm (complete or partial) except that of the strong verb, but not even in the course of the latter's explanation are other classes of verbs (guttural, defective or contract) so much as mentioned in successive contrast, still less displayed in any examples. "It will suffice," the author believes (p. 60), "for beginners to study the roots of the ordinary strong, and non-guttural, verb, because these roots use only the primary principles of verbal development." But, given the primary, can the beginner work out the rest for himself, or even grasp his teacher's exposition of it, with never a sight of it in print? Considering that, in any normal passage of text, the other verbs together outnumber the strong forms by about ten to one, a complete set of paradigms at hand for reference is a necessity to the average student in checking his own calculations and reducing them to serviceable memory.

We have touched upon only a few main features. Many points of excellence in this manual would most willingly have been indicated, had not space confined us to the paramount question and the chief issues for its decision. But the prospect of usefulness for Father Yungfleisch's work is inseparable from the merits of the method to which its whole conception and construction are committed. We believe that some teachers of seminary Hebrew—we can certainly speak for one—will thank the author for a helpful outline of much, if not all, of the common Semitic background of Hebrew. Should any one be further disposed to introduce the manual into his elementary classes, the present reviewer would be the last to utter a deterrent word. But he must also confess that, after twenty-two years in the classroom, he would not be the first to follow that example.

W. H. McCLELLAN, S.J.

MARTIN KIDDLE, M.A. (Oxon), *The Revelation of Saint John* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1940). Pp. V, 460. $3.50.

This volume forms part of The Moffat New Testament Commentary and therefore is based on Dr. Moffat's translation of the New Testament. This translation first appeared in 1913. The idea of the Commentary arose from a repeated demand to have Moffat's New Testament translation explained. The aim of the Commentary is to bring out the religious meaning and message of the New Testament writings. To do this involves literary and historical criticism; otherwise our reading becomes unintelligent. But the literary criticism of the Commentary does not lose sight of the fact that the New Testament was written out of faith and for faith, and therefore is litertaure with a religious purpose. Within certain broad limits each commentator is left free; the governing rule is to enable the reader to understand what he is reading in the New Testament. As every man has not made a study of Greek, the commentary has been written for the Greekless, but it is based on a first-hand study of the Greek original.

The commentary on the Book of Revelation is by M. A. Kiddle with the assistance of M. K. Ross. The book of the Apocalypse, to use its ancient and more common title, is unlike any other book of the New Testament, and yet it is full of instruction and consolation for all those who read its inspired pages. But very few read its inspired pages. Of all the books of the New Testament the Apocalypse is probably read least; not because it is least interesting, for it is most fascinating, but because of its extreme difficulty. With some passages every one is familiar but as soon as we begin to read the book as a whole we are perplexed by the obscurities which confront us in almost every line. The dictum of St. Jerome strikes us with renewed force: "the Apocalypse has as many mysteries as words, or rather mysteries in every word." And yet St. John undoubtedly wrote his book for ordinary people. John's interest was strictly pastoral; he had a message and he wrote to his fellow-Christians with the firm conviction that he could encourage and warn them in times of extreme urgency. His purpose was to explain, not to obscure, and to enlighten, not to darken. And yet there are strange symbols in the book. These symbols in our day need an interpreter. Dr. Kiddle in his commentary attempts to be that interpreter and for the most part succeeds.

Dr. Kiddle does not underestimate the difficulties of the Apocalypse, for he informs us that any one who puts his hand to write a commentary on the Apocalypse is a bold man and no one knows how difficult the task is except the one who has tried it. According to Dr. Kiddle most of the difficulties in the Apocalypse are the legacy of time, and therefore the best method of solving the difficulties is to put oneself in the place of the Christians of St. John's day and analyse the problems from their viewpoint. It is true that time and fanciful interpretations have added difficulties to the original but all the difficulties are not the result of time. The Apocalypse presented difficulties to the original readers; its predictions were vaguely discerned as they were for the most part unfulfilled. Some parts that were understood by the first Christians are vaguely understood today, for the key to their decipherment was lost by the end of the first century, as can be seen from the later commentators But it is a good method to go back to the beginning, and the method gives a remarkable, though at times vague, explanation of the visions of the Apocalypse.

The commentary is preceded by an Introduction. Such questions as the modern approach to the Apocalypse, John's creative genius as a visionary, unity, authenticity, date, historical associations of the text and the abiding value of the Apocalypse are discussed. The Apocalypse is the work of one hand, though John made use of various sources. The theories which mutilate the text are unconvincing and unnecessary; unconvincing because they are without objective foundation; unnecessary because they could and do not help explain the text. In the visions of Saint John we find many details which are intellectually but not pictorially comprehensible; for example, it is impossible to visualize 'eyes inside and out' or to reconstruct a creature with the face of a man but with eyes all over. Dr. Kiddle is of the opinion that John wrote to the churches, convinced that history was about to be wound up; it is true that John writes about things which "must shortly come to pass," but he speaks of the beginning of a series of things which will precede the End, and not of the End, because the visions in the rest of the book show that a long time will elapse before the End. Certainly the Christians of the seven churches would not be alive at the End. Who was the Author? According to Dr. Kiddle the mystery of authorship may prove the one mystery of the book which will never be revealed in this world. The author, however, was John, a John well known to the churches, and not a shadowy figure like John the Elder or some equally unknown John. The only well known John is John the Evangelist. The book was written during the reign of Domitian because of its historical associations or allusions. The abiding value and greatest contribution to religious thought in the book is John's superb confidence that victory would be won by the Church. Of course this confidence came to John from his visions.

The commentary, for the most part, is lucid, forceful, unexaggerated and of interest not only to scholars but to every thinking man, for whom the last book of the New Testament has always been a mystery.

J. S. CONSIDINE, O.P.

GRACE T. TRUMBULL. *Tongues of Fire.* A Bible Composed of Sacred Scriptures of the Non-Christian World (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1941). Pp. xxvi, 422. $3.50.

Tongues of Fire is an anthology of ancient oriental literature. Its chief interest to the biblical scholar and the student of the history of religions lies in the fact that the author has collected and provided in a single volume excerpts from the ancient non-biblical literature of the East. Several selections, e.g., Early Conceptions of the Genesis of the World, The Egyptian Book of Wisdom, and The Accadian, Babylonian, and Egyptian Collection should prove useful to the student of the Old Testament.

While it is true that the Sacred Books of the East contain countless passages of beauty and literary appeal, it is not possible, as the author suggests, to put them on the same plane as Sacred Scripture or the Word of God. The Sacred Scriptures are and remain the divinely inspired Word of God, whereas the sacred literature of the East is and remains the product of mere human literary genius.

Each section is prefaced by a brief introduction; the arrangement, notes, references to sources and the bibliography are helpful.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O. S. A.

RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR BOYLAN, M.A., D.LITT., D.D., P.P., *The Sunday Epistles and Gospels* (Dublin: Brown and Nolan, 1941). Volume II. Pp. vi, 322. Price, 7s 6d.

With this volume Monsignor Boylan completes his translation and commentary on the Sunday Epistles and Gospels from Easter Sunday to the Last Sunday after Pentecost. As in the first volume, the author's purpose is threefold: first, to provide a direct translation of the Epistles and Gospels from the Greek; secondly, to supply notes and comments on them; thirdly, to indicate the material and thoughts for the Sunday sermon based on either the Epistle or Gospel (cf. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 3, 1941, 281 f.).

The exegetical notes for *The Sunday Epistles and Gospels* are copious and should prove very useful. As far as possible, disputed points are avoided, and the more acceptable interpretation of authors is proposed and followed. Greek terms and phrases are transliterated in parenthesis and explained.

In the "Thoughts on Preaching," the author suggests and outlines the ways in which the Sunday Epistles and Gospels may be applied to the needs of the time. It is, however, to be regretted that the author did not treat in a similar way the important Feasts of the ecclesiastical year.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O. S. A.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Some of these may be reviewed in subsequent issues)

William H. Sadlier, Inc., New York City, N. Y.:

A Gospel Harmony. Using the Confraternity Edition of the New Testament. By Rev. John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.S.L. 1942. Pp. xl, 166. $2.50.

St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N. J.:

Outlines of Suggested Sermons on the New Testament. Appropriate for the Pre-Lenten and Lenten Season. Prepared by the Catholic Biblical Association of America. 1942. Pp. iv, 20.

REVISTA BIBLICA. Organo trimestral para la inteligencia de la Sagrada Escritura. Ano III, Noviembre-Diciembre de 1941.

THE DECALOGUE IN THE PREACHING OF JEREMIAS

A cursory glance at recent bibliography will convince anyone that the preaching of Jeremias peculiarly claims the attention and interest of modern scholars. The study is as versatile as it is extensive and with the usual divergence of opinion that particularly prevails amongst the critics. These differences, for the most part, originate in neglecting the proper consideration of two fundamental factors, namely, the religious activity of Jeremias as a prophet in Israel, and the singular characteristics of his book as it has come down to us. It is the first that orientates his political life and gives the proper perspective to his social status. Throughout his whole ministry he was preoccupied with a contemporary dualism in religion, i.e. the legitimate religion of Moses, and a religious syncretism of popular pagan superstitions that contaminated all the sacred traditions of the former.

For the most part, the attention of the great preacher was concentrated on three pertinent facts of religious life: Sin, Conversion, and Judgment.[1] These may be said to constitute the general theme of his preaching and a brief synthesis of his ideology regarding these matters reveals how consonant it is with Mosaic doctrine. Every sin committed against the true cult or the social relations of mankind is regarded by Jeremias as a public infidelity to God. Indeed, sins offending religious observance hasten the moral ruin of the nation and are the occasion of national reverses. The only means of averting the just punishment of Yahweh is sincere conversion that has renounced all vice and wickedness in political and personal life as well as in cult. Yet Jeremias felt that his warning was in vain because men's hearts were so hardened in their sin that reform was radically frustrated. It was precisely this circumstance that fathered his proverbial jeremiad. The latter could be described as the negative content of the preaching of Jeremias. This characteristic is of great moment in the consideration of our theme because of its evident relation to the Decalogue. But there was more than mere denunciation in the preaching of Jeremias. Its most positive value is in promising the restoration of Israel through a New Covenant that would completely transcend the Old.

The recorded preaching of Jeremias has come down to us partly in poetic form and partly in prose that was originally arranged by his faithful secretary Baruch. Therefore, what we possess in our biblical text is rather a record of the sermons of the Prophet, some of them verbatim, others in summary, by way of letter, etc. Furthermore, textual criticism finds a problem in the Greek and Hebrew recensions, the solution of which is still a point of investigation.[2] In spite of these difficulties the authorship is reducible to Jeremias.[3] Yet it is obvious that these matters must be kept in mind in interpreting the "Word that came to Jeremias from the Lord" (Jer. 7:1).

---

[1] Cf. Noetscher, F., *Das Buch Jeremias*, Bonn, 1934, pp. 16-19.

The general trend of opinion amongst critics concerning the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue is one of denial. Not a few contend that the Decalogue is nothing more than a compendium of the sermonizing of the Prophets.[4] This necessarily includes the prophecies and preaching of Jeremias. They further maintain that the neglect of appeal to Moses on the part of the Prophets themselves is a significant silence that they did not consider him to be the author of the Decalogue. Moreover, they affirm that the morality of the Decalogue emphatically indicates an eighth century origin when religious cult did not as yet exist. Other critics allege that the Decalogue is a product of Jewish theology after the exile.[5] A more conservative school recognizes the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue substantially, but claims a progressive evolution for its literary form and admits additions responding to exigencies in the course of time.[6] All those hypotheses involve the book of Jeremias, although only in an indirect way do they associate and infer its relation to the Decalogue.

Other critical investigation and studies specifically concern the key position of the book of Jeremias in sacred literature for elucidating the dark history of the Decalogue. H. M. Weber[7] maintains that the catalogue of sins in the denunciations of the prophets do not pertain to the ethics of the Decalogue, nor do they evidence any relation or connection with it. In Jeremias, however, he finds a sublimity that readily suggests the Decalogue, nevertheless this is no testimony of the same having been known to the Prophet himself. B. Baentsch[8] in delineating the origin of the Decalogue, adduces Jer. 32:18 as the first witness of its existence.

---

[2] Cf. Condamin, A., *Le Livre de Jeremie*^{3}, Paris, 1936, p. XVI-XVIII; Schoepfer, A., *Geschichte des Alten Testament*^{6}, Innsbruck 1923, p. 551.

[3] Cf. Goettsberger, J., *Einleitung in Das Alte Testament*, Freiburg in B. 1928, p. 300 f.

[4] Cf. Eberharter, A., "Der Dekalog," *Biblische Zeitfragen*, Folge 13, Heft 3/4, Muenster in W. 1930, p. 6.

[5] Cf. Marti, K., *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion*^{3}, Strassbourg, 1907, p. 194; Meinhold, J., *Der Dekalog*, Giessen 1927, p. 16.

[6] Cf. Gunkel, H., *Die orientalischen Literaturen*, Goettingen 1900, p. 75; Driver, S. R., *Exodus*, Cambridge 1911, p. 195 f.; Koenig, E., *Ist die moderne Pentateuchkritik auf Tatsachen begruendet?*, Stuttgart 1933, p. 45 f.

[7] Cf. Weber, H. N., in Archiv fuer Socialwissenschaft und Socialethik 46 (1918/19) p. 86. The article is cited at length by A. Eberharter in *Der Dekalog, l.c.*

H. Schmidt[9] admits a substantial Mosaic authorship for some of the commandments and seeks to establish and isolate from the actual literary form the primitive Decalogue in contradistinction to its presumed accretions. A trace of this primitive Decalogue he finds in Jer. 7:8-9: "Behold you put your trust in lying words, which shall not profit you: To steal, to murder, to commit adultery, to swear falsely, to offer to Baalim, and to go after strange gods, which you know not." Obviously the two-fold table of the Law is apparent, with certain expressions suggesting the first precepts of the Decalogue, whilst the remaining ones concern the social relations of men and form the nucleus of the second table. The absence of any allusion to the Sabbath or the honoring of parents is indicative of their non-existence in the primitive ten commandments. Only after the time of Jeremias can we suppose such precepts to have originated, because they adequately fall into the circumstances of the decentralization of religion after the fall of Jerusalem and the need of the preservation of social and political unity. The Sabbath precept was legislated to take care of the first interest, whilst the fourth commandment compelled a solid bond of fraternity that would ultimately conserve and foster inherent nationalism. Finally, H. Schmidt declares the wording of the Decalogue to be a manifest infiltration of texts from Ex. 20 and Deut. 5.[10]

[8] Cf. Baentsch, B., *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri ubersetzt und erklart*, Goettingen 1903, p. 78.

[9] Cf. Schmidt, Hans, "Moses und der Dekalog," *Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Neue Folge, Heft 19, 1923, pp. 82-119.

[10] Cf. Schmidt, H., *op. cit.* p. 106; "Man muss doch daraus schliessen dass die zehn Worte noch zu seiner (Jeremias) Zeit ohne die Ausfuellung gesprochen worden sind, dass die Hinzufuegung der Gebote vom Sabbat und von den Eltern also erst aus der Zeit nach Jeremias stammt."

2

The writings of the prophets lack any express citation or nominal commemoration of the Decalogue. Nevertheless, the Prophets vehemently decry the people's sins as evidence of desertion from some norm recognized by all as duly sanctioned. The very description of these sins points to the Decalogue as the fundamental basis of appeal which the Prophets are employing, and which lends authority, dignity, and sanctity precisely because of being founded on the traditional Mosaic Law.[11] A similar procedure is decisively apparent in the book of Jeremias, and one cannot help but sense the figure of Moses and the Decalogue in the background, inspiring the preaching of the great prophet of Anathoth, who, in turn, addresses his audience with the conviction of approval from this highest and ultimate authority.

The first instance of this is the immediate and direct use of the expression "Torah."[12] At the time of Jeremias, the term was already technical and the accepted idiom amongst the Israelites for the Law of Moses. In its comprehensive sense, it necessarily included the Decalogue. It cannot be denied that Jeremias frequently had the history and tradition of the Decalogue in mind as a subordinate, yet essential, theme of his sermonizing. Thus, he significantly refers to the scenes of liberation from Egyptian bondage in 2:1-8, as a testimonial of the goodness and bounty of Yahweh. The passage is terse, but there is every evidence that he is familiar with all that came to pass in the desert. Moreover, the Prophet is aware that on this occasion commandments were given to his people (cf. Jer. 7:22-23) and hence he could well exalt and encourage obedience to the same.

There is obvious allusion to the Decalogue in Jer. 16:11: "Because your fathers forsook me, saith the Lord, and went after *strange gods, and served them, and adored them:* and they forsook me and kept not my *law.* And you have done worse than your fathers."[13] There can be no doubt that these words literally concern the first commandment in the Decalogue and in such a way that one readily surmises that the familiar figure of speech is being employed wherein a part implicitly involves the whole. Furthermore, all this is to be identified with the Law, as expressed in the intimate term אֶת־תוֹרָתִי even though mention has been made of only one precept out of ten.

---

[11] Cf. Kortleitner, F. X., *Formae cultus Mosaici cum ceteris religionibus orientis antiqui comparatae*^{3}, Inssbruck 1933, p. 89 f.

[12] See also Jer. 2:8; 6:19; 8:8; 9:13; 16:11; 26:3,4; 44:23.

[13] It will be observed that the context assigns these words to Yahweh. Their literalness as parcel of the burden of Jeremias demonstrates how sensitively conscious the Prophet was of his obligation towards the word of God. Cf. Jer. 1; 11:18 ff; 15:10-15; 17:14-18; 18:18 ff; 20:7 ff.

It is generally conceded by most exegetes that a double narrative is given of the famous Temple Sermon in the book of Jeremias, viz. Jer. 7:1-15 and Jer. 26. Since it is equally accepted amongst authorities that Jer. 7:9 in some way refers to the Decalogue, there is no difficulty in assigning the precise sense of Decalogue to Jer. 26:4: "And thou shalt say to them; Thus saith the Lord: If you will not hearken to me to walk *in my law,* which I have given to you: to give ear to the words of my servants the prophets, whom I sent to you rising up early." In this passage the phrase בְּתוֹרָתִי has specific reference to the Decalogue. It should likewise be noted that this *law* is proposed as something both traditional and familiar to all the Prophets preceding Jeremias, whom Yahweh "rising up early" had sent to his people and continued to send down through the ages.

The sins censured by Jeremias throughout his preaching are nothing else but offenses committed against the Decalogue. As a matter of fact, critics will allow that it is in the book of Jeremias that by far the greater number of precepts in the Decalogue are found represented in this negative way.[14] At least seven of the commandments can be readily discerned in the nature of the crimes condemned and, in some instances, an accepted terminology is disclosed that unmistakably suggests the Decalogue. Only the fourth, ninth, and tenth commandments lack representation. For the most part, the sins denounced are those against the first and eighth precepts, with references to the former occurring some fifteen times and the latter eleven times. The Prophet more than once deplores and decries the non-observance of the first commandment as the root of the tribulations and calamities in that day.[15] The following catalogue of texts demonstrates evidence of the several types of crimes that particularly merited the severe castigation of Jeremias:

[14] See H. M. Weber as cited by A. Eberharter, *op. cit.* p. 21.

[15] See Jer. 1:16; 22:9; 44:23.

I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
1:16	4:2	17:19-27		7:6	7:9	2:26	3:23		5:8
5:19	5:2			7:9	23:10	6:13	6:13		
7:9	7:9			7:31	23:14	7:9	7:9		
13:10				9:2	29:23	22:3	9:1f		
16:11				26:15			27:14		
19:3f							27:15		
19:13							27:16		
22:9							28:15		
25:6							29:9		
32:29							29:21		
35:15									
44:23									

Such statistics lead to but one conclusion, namely, that the Decalogue was a persistent factor in the preaching of Jeremias. That these transgressions offend against a law other than the purely natural law is confirmed by the fact that in many instances it is Yahweh who condemns them as against "my words" (Jer. 13:10), "my law" (Jer. 16:11), "the covenant of the Lord" (Jer. 22:9), "his commandments" (Jer. 44:23; 17:22). These expressions as they stand in the individual texts are adapted to a knowledge of the hearers, for whom they have meaning because of the one and only Law known to them as consecrated by Yahweh, the Mosaic Law.

As previously mentioned, the classic reference to the Decalogue in the Book of Jeremias is that cited in Jer. 7:1-15. This sermon was probably delivered at a time when the influence of King Joakim was beginning to penetrate and exert a corrupting ascendancy in the religious life of the people. Following the disheartening defeat at Megiddo in 608 B.C. by the Egyptian Pharaoh Necho, and the subsequent loss of their noble King Josias, the Israelites began to abandon wholly the religious reformation that had successfully prevailed throughout the latter's reign, and to lapse into pagan superstitions practised and fostered by his successor Joakim. It was this base repudiation of Yahweh that fired the stirring oratory of Jeremias into proclaiming that the true salvation of Juda lay in things moral, i.e. conversion from their evil ways.[16] Thus, the Prophet dramatically focusses their attention upon the observance of the Decalogue as fundamental for effecting the necessary spiritual transformation that will restore Israel to God's favour and consequent protection. Jeremias supposes his audience to be already familiar with the Decalogue when he admonishes them in 7:4: "Trust not in *lying* words" דִּבְרֵי הַשֶּׁקֶר. The word שֶׁקֶר savors of Exodus 20:16. Likewise in 7:6, the expressions "Shed not innocent blood in this place and walk not after strange gods to your own heart" throw into perspective the fifth and first commandments respectively. וְאַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים לֹא תֵלְכוּ is the crystallized adaptation of Ex. 20:2-7 and Deut. 5:6-11. However, it is in Jer. 7:8-9,

---

[16] Cf. Jer. 7:3-5.

> 8 Behold you put your trust in lying words, which shall not profit you:
>
> 9 To steal, to murder, to commit adultery, to swear falsely, to offer to Baalim, and to go after strange gods, which you know not,

that the Mosaic Decalogue really appears with prominence and emphasis. H. Schmidt rightly discerns that the passage reflects a cognizance of the two-fold table of the Law.[17] There is no attempt to preserve the accepted order in the Decalogue, inasmuch as we find that order actually inverted, and with mention of only certain commandments out of the two divisions that constitute the well-known tables of the Law. But the arrangement is so comprehensive as to suggest immediately that the author intended to present a formidable nucleus of the Sinaitic Law. Here the Hebrew terminology is incontestably akin to Exodus and Deuteronomy. The recurrent idiom can only be construed as indicative of a common source, the Mosaic Decalogue. Moreover, when one grasps the ideology underlying the whole context, it is apparent that the appeal of Jeremies has compelling force for his hearers precisely because he is invoking the sanctity and tradition of the Decalogue as opposed to the comparatively recent pagan superstitions which have gained their confidence and into which they have fallen.

Jeremias confronted his people with a stern denunciation of their degenerate reliance on and belief in the mere material sacrifices perfunctorily performed in their midst (cf. Jer. 7:21-23). The vehemence and passion of the Prophet's discourse has led the critics to conjecture falsely that cult, of any kind, was a thing foreign to the Israelitic religion in the estimation of Jeremias and conceived by him as sinful in itself.[18] The context of this passage reveals the very contrary. It is manifestly concerned with the degrading abuses that have reduced sacrifices to a mere eating of flesh-meat.[19] The people have so forgotten true values that it becomes necessary for the prophet to contrast the primary importance of the Decalogue with the subordinate character of sacrifice:[20]

---

[17] Cf. Schmidt, H., *op. cit.* p. 104 "Sehen wir dass dem Propheten eine Gebotssammlung vorschwebt die in zwei Gruppen zerfaellt, die das Verhalten gegen Gott und solche, die das Verhalten der Menschen unter einander betreffen."

> For I spoke not to your fathers, and I commanded them not, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning the matter of burnt offerings and sacrifices. But this thing I commanded them saying: Hearken to my voice, and I will be your God and you shall be my people: and walk ye in all the way that I have commanded you, that it may be well with you.

Jeremias throws into relief the true order of things, namely, that historically the precepts of the Decalogue preceded the regulations regarding sacrifice (cf. Ex. 20:24). Therefore, he demonstrates that sacrifice is something wholly secondary in the divine economy and inculcates good moral living as more pleasing to Yahweh than sacrifices devoid of religious spirit through neglect of the essentials contained in the Decalogue.

Jeremias was emphatic about the evils that would come upon Israel for an impenitence that had waxed into the irrational complacency which he severely indicated in 8:8: "How do you say: We are wise and the law of the Lord is with us? Indeed, the lying pen of the scribes hath wrought falsehood." These words carry the burden of allusion to facts that are obscured in our limited knowledge of the history of the period as it has come down to us. They speak of a "law of the Lord" that certainly must be identified with the same Mosaic Law which Jeremias has invoked on other occasions as familiar to his hearers. Probably the expression is to be taken in its full sense because of the universal wickedness herein condemned. Their context suggests the arrogant assurance of certain Jews who were advancing the Law of Yahweh as an endorsement for their evil practices. Jeremias exposes the iniquity of such appeal and brands it as founded upon falsehood, perpetrated by their malicious and deceptive interpretations of the Law itself. The situation has its parallel in the activities of the Scribes and Pharisees at the time of Christ and roundly condemned in Mt. 23 and Lk. 11:52. It will be noticed that Jeremias does not hesitate to arraign this crime of false interpretation as an offence against the eighth precept of the Decalogue. The Hebrew is very graphic: הִנֵּה לַשֶּׁקֶר עָשָׂה עֵט שֶׁקֶר סֹפְרִים "Lo, the lying pen of the Scribes hath made a lie." Indeed, the verse following tells how very far these Scribes had gone: "The wise men are confounded, they are dismayed and taken: for they have cast away the word of the Lord and there is no wisdom in them."

---

[18] Thus C. H. Cornill, *Des Buch Jeremias erklart*, Leipzig, 1905, p. 101f; A. C. Welch, *Jeremias, his time and his work*, London, 1928, p. 143; J. Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion*^{3}, Cambridge, 1930, p. 182.

[19] The words of Yahweh "Add your burnt offerings to your sacrifices and eat ye flesh" have all the irony of exasperation in them.

[20] Cf. Ricciotti, G., *Il Libro di Geremia*, Turin, 1923, p. 115f.

There is an indication of the fifth commandment in Jer. 26: 15-19. The chapter recounts the historical episode when Jeremias was apprehended by the priests and accused of preaching the downfall of Juda. His defense included this trenchant remark: "But know ye, that if you put me to death, you will shed innocent blood against your own selves, and against this city, and the inhabitants thereof." The princes and people suddenly recognized the gravity and truth of Jeremias' statement and rallied to his vindication by recalling the stern preaching of Micheas, prophet in the days of Ezechias (721-693), who in spite of similar warnings went unmolested. "Fear of the Lord" stayed any intention of inflicting a death penalty that they felt would have been the equivalent of murder. These defenders of Jeremias could and did rightly infer that "therefore we are doing a great evil to our souls" (v. 19) if they put him to death. The psychological background of the whole passage fundamentally and validly rests upon a knowledge of the fifth precept of the Decalogue which condemns the perpetration of an unjustifiable death penalty.

The sublime prophecy of the New Covenant is the most formidable manifestation of Jeremias' historical knowledge of the Decalogue (cf. Jer. 31:31-34). In describing the nature of this New Covenant he boldly employs the Sinaitic Law as a basis of comparison:

> Behold the days shall come, saith the Lord, and I will make a New Covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Juda: Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt... I *will write* my law in their bowels, and I *will write* it in their heart: and I will be their God and they will be my people (Jer. 31:31-32).

The description is concise and sententious, appealing to tradition and only has meaning when one recalls such passages as Ex. 20:12; 31:18; 32:15; 34:28-29; Deut. 5:22; 9:10. The detail is so obvious as to preclude any possibility of doubt in the matter. Besides the historical data inherent in the context there is the emphatic item of the Old Covenant having been a written law. And the definite limitations of that written law are accentuated by way of inference to its having been committed on tablets of stone and thus consigned to an elect people. In contrast, the New Law will be eminently supreme for all men and will never suffer the hazard of oblivion because it will be written in men's hearts and engender that charity and sanctity wherein sin will be forever cast out so that God "will remember their sin no more" (Jer. 31:34).

3

Objections have been urged by the critics who radically deny any positive evidence of the Decalogue in the preaching of the Prophet Jeremias. Since there is no suggestion or trace of the fourth, ninth, and tenth commandments in the Book of Jeremias, they suppose that these were unknown to him. Several considerations, however, explain the *quasi* eclecticism of Jeremias with regard to the Decalogue. Jeremias was primarily a preacher; the limitations of rhetoric and oratory necessarily circumscribe his objectives. He had no obligation, neither would it have been prudent, to chasten his people with a specific enumeration of their sins. Such cataloguing would defeat his very purpose and aim. Psychologically, it was more practical to expose those social and personal crimes which were particularly undermining the moral fibre of the whole nation. And thus it is that the sins which he so severely denounced, were sins against precepts that quite overreach the fourth, ninth, and tenth commandments. The latter precepts rather concern themselves with purely internal sins. The designs of Jeremias were better served by first disclosing those external evils which had so corrupted the social and religious environment. In their remedy, he would be assured of the restoration and observance of the other commandments respecting more personal interior life.

Mention of the Sabbath is concentrated in one sermon of Jeremias (17:20-28). This singularity prompts critics to regard the passage as an unauthentic interpolation. They further assume that it had its origin some time after the exile when observance of the Sabbath became an important feature in the lives of the exiled Jews through the rise of synagogues. Moreover, they maintain that Jer. 17:20-28 patently contradicts the spirit of Jeremias' denouncement of formal religious cult. It is obvious that the latter objection is a corollary of the false exegesis of Jer. 7:22. They finally add that the external character of the Sabbath ordinance conflicts with the doctrine of individualistic spirituality fostered by Jeremias.

W. Emery Barnes[21] points out that the Sabbath actually has an interior character about it that approximates the objectives of Jeremias. He notes that Ezechiel, contemporary of Jeremias, commemorates the Sabbath as a sign of true relation between Yahweh and Israel (cf. Ex. 20:12). Sacrifice and temple and ark and lawbook were not unknown to the Babylonians and Egyptians as well. The Sabbath, however, was something unique and peculiar to the Israelites, a day consecrated to Yahweh and the observance of which made them conscious of their distinctive character as an elect people of God. Consequently its *de facto* profanation undermined loyalty to Yahweh, and thus Jeremias did not hesitate to argue its sanctity as something already traditional: "Sanctify the Sabbath day, as I have commanded your fathers" (Jer. 17:22). A twofold profanation is hinted in the text, namely, "carry no burdens on the Sabbath day" (Jer. 17:21) and "neither do ye any work." It is probable that Jeremias had in mind the consequences of the royal command of King Joakim; wherefore servile labor must have continued throughout the Sabbath in the construction of the new kingly palace (cf. Jer. 22:13-19). That is why the sermon is forcefully addressed to the "kings of Juda" (Jer. 17:20), a factor that sustains authenticity and belies any post-exilic origin when such interpolation would lack significance and meaning, especially for a Jerusalem already destroyed and laid waste.

Since the Decalogue is found in the Book of Deuteronomy, one may well ask what is the relation of Deuteronomy to the book of Jeremias? The answer to this question has created a variety of opinion amongst the critics. Some influence is allowed but the similarities are by many relegated to a deuteronomistic redactor. Such a line of explanation falls in with the Wellhausian ideas of a post-exilic origin for the Pentateuch in general, which postulate has yet to be proven before the argumentation can have validity.[22] That is why others frankly and legitimately suppose that Jeremias was familiar with the Book of Deuteronomy in its entirety.

---

[21] Cf. W. Emery Barnes, "Prophecy and the Sabbath," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 22 (1928), p. 286-388.

But here again one may ask whether or not Jeremias held a position of antagonism to the newly found book of the Law, which many are ready to identify with Deuteronomy. The key to the problem is to be found in Jer. 11:1-23. The similarity of thought and style throughout the whole passage,[23] force the conclusion that Jeremias not only knew Deuteronomy but favored its doctrine and teaching as something traditional and sacred. For that reason critics have ventured to deny the authenticity of Jer. 11:1-8 and cite Jer. 3:10 and 8:8 as evidence of his earnest attitude towards Deuteronomy. In the latter texts they suppose the law therein mentioned to be Deuteronomy. On the contrary, we have seen that these texts really concern the false interpretation of the true law as concocted by the pharisaical minds of that day and age.

Could Jeremias have taken his allusions to the Decalogue from Deuteronomy? This question is intimately linked with the history of the finding of the book of the Law in 621 B.C. and recorded in 2 Kgs. 22-23 and 2 Par. 34. If this book is to be identified with Deuteronomy,[24] there is every reason to believe that Jeremias would fortify the appeal of his preaching by quoting the newly found document whose discovery had recently created such sensation and aroused exuberant enthusiasm.

4

In conclusion, the foregoing observations present a modest summary of facts that establish the homiletic character of the preaching of Jeremias and the wellspring of his artistry.

---

[22] "Vestigia (Deut.) in libris antiquioribus tam historicis quam propheticis plurima sunt: at critici vim probandi eis denegant contendendo omnes has allegationes et similitudines deberi "redactori deuteronomistico." Sed nemo non videt hic agi de circulo vitioso. Hic modus procedendi tum tantum legitimus esset, si critici originem posteriorem Deut. *aliunde* cum certitudine probassent: quod cum factum non sit, omnes hi textus vim suam probandi retinent." Vide apud Bea, A., *Institutiones Biblicae*² II¹, 110 f.

[23] Compare Jer. 11:3 with Deut. 27:6; 11:4; Jer. 11:4 with 4:20; Jer. 11:5 with 7:12,13; 6:3; 11:9; 2:30; 6:24; 29:27 etc. Jer. 11:8 with 29:18. See A. Condamin *op. cit.* p. 106.

[24] Some authors claim that the book found was the whole Mosaic Law, but even in that sense it would include Deuteronomy. See A. Schoepfer, *op. cit.* pp. 307-311.

(1) The Decalogue is an undeniable factor in the preaching of Jeremias.

(2) Yet it exists there in indirect and obscure fashion because the Prophet appeals to it under the crystallized technical term of "Law." That Law is none other than the Mosaic Decalogue (cf. Jer. 31:31-34; 7:22, etc.), and by vividly projecting crimes and sins of his people against it, Jeremias supposes his hearers to respect it as traditional and sacred.

(3) The Decalogue as it is found in the preaching of Jeremias is primitive only in the sense that a nucleus of the original is present and in its familiar terminology. The most forceful evidence of this is found in Jer. 7:9 where the two tables of the Sinaitic Law are graphically suggested.

Finally, the fact that the Decalogue does underlie the preaching of Jeremias elevates and consecrates it in the tradition dear to the heart of every Israelite of his day because it descends from Moses, the greatest of the prophets. It is the Decalogue that links Moses and Jeremias in a unity of purpose and activity as agents and instruments of that divine economy wherein the honor and glory of God was to be realized.

EUSTACE J. SMITH, O.F.M., S.T.L., S.S.L.

St. Bonaventure Seminary
St. Bonaventure, New York

THE BIBLE AND LITURGY

It should be no matter of surprise to any who have at all studied the connection that the Liturgy of the Church draws its text to such a great extent from the books of Sacred Scripture. The sacred volume was the first liturgical book, the selections from Scripture read as lessons comprising the major portion of the vocal part of the service, the Psalter being the original hymn book, while the prayers which make up the rest of the liturgy, extemporaneous at first but gradually crystallized into their present form, were and are largely scriptural in their inspiration and their phraseology.

The Mass is divided into two sections: the Mass of the Catechumens, which is easily nine-tenths scriptural, and the Mass of the Faithful, which is a development of the New Testament account of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist, repeating, in obedience to the precept of Jesus Christ, what He Himself did at the Last Supper. In this section of the Mass, the prayers of the Offertory, the Consecration, and the Communion, although of ecclesiastical origin, nevertheless include some that are wholly scriptural, like the Psalm *Lavabo* and the *Pater noster,* the *Agnus Dei* and the *Domine non sum dignus,* while others are at least reminiscent of Sacred Scripture in their thought or in their expression.

In the Mass of the Catechumens, it is a psalm, the *Judica,* which ordinarily begins the preparatory prayers. The Introit is only exceptionally non-scriptural and always includes a verse from the Psalter. The *Kyrie* is scriptural in concept and in word. The *Gloria* is an expansion of the angelic hymn, recorded by St. Luke (2:14). The Lessons, the Epistle and the Gospel, are patently Scripture readings. The Gradual, alleluiatic verse, the Tract, and the great Alleluia of Paschaltide, originally always Psalms, are today rarely from sources other than the sacred text. This leaves only the Confiteor, a few verses and responses, the Collects, and the *Munda cor meum* as the non-biblical prayers of the first section of the Mass. The *Credo,* while non-scriptural, is of late introduction, but is really an epitome of fundamental truths, all explicitly expressed in the New Testament.

Passing to the Mass of the Faithful, our Lord, at the Last Supper, took bread and wine and so, at Mass, we have the Offertory. He blessed and consecrated them, and so we have the Consecration of the Mass. He broke the bread and distributed it and gave to drink of the chalice to the Apostles, and again, in conformity with the divine example and precept, we have Holy Communion. The actions, therefore, of the Mass of the Faithful are quite scriptural. It is true, the prayers of this most important part of the Mass are not of the biblical text to the degree to which are those of the Mass of the Catechumens. The Offertory chant, however, is generally from the Psalms, often from another book of the Bible, and occasionally of ecclesiastical composition. The Offertory prayers, at the oblation of the host and chalice and at the accompanying ceremonies, are indeed medieval but to some extent, as in the case of the *In spiritu humilitatis* and the prayers of incensing, are either based on Scripture or contain quotations from it. The Secret Prayers, like the Collects, which they parallel, are traditional and non-biblical. The Preface is evidently scriptural in inspiration and concludes with the *Sanctus* (Isa. 6:3). The Canon, with the exception of the Consecration itself, is of ecclesiastical origin but with frequent scriptural allusions, like the word *rationabilem* of the *Quam oblationem,* which recalls the "reasonable sacrifice" of Rom. 12:1, and the reference to the oblation of Abel and Abraham and Melchisedech in the second prayer after Consecration. The central act of the liturgy, the sacrificial Transubstantiation, is effected by the words of eucharistic institution, in the Mass a harmonious synthesis of the four New Testament texts which narrate the words and actions of Jesus Christ at the Last Supper, with several non-evangelic additions, like *elevatis oculis, mysterium fidei,* and a conclusion, *Haec quotiescunque feceritis,* etc., which is an adaptation of the expression of our Lord bidding His Apostles to perform what He had just done. The *Pater noster,* at the end of the Canon, is the Lord's prayer as found in Mt. 6:9-13. The *Libera* is the embolism of the concluding phrase of the "Our Father." The *Agnus Dei* is a paraphrase of St. John the Baptist's greeting at the approach of our Lord. The three non-scriptural prayers before Communion were originally private prayers which did not receive official sanction until the publication of the Missal of Pius V. *Panem coelestem accipiam* is a variation of Ps. 115:4. The *Domine non sum dignus,* with the substitution of *anima* for *puer,* is the declaration of the centurion in Mt. 8:6. *Quid retribuam Domino,* at the taking of the chalice, is Ps. 11:3-4 and 17:4. The two prayers for the ablutions are survivals of medieval private prayers.

The short service of thanksgiving, which follows the Communion and concludes the Mass, is more predominantly scriptural than might at first be presumed. The Communion verse, originally an entire Psalm, sung during the long period required for the general Communion of the faithful under both species, is almost inevitably from the Bible, either a verse from the Psalter or a significant passage from the Gospel of the day. The Post-Communion, a prayer of thanksgiving after Holy Communion, is non-biblical in source, as is the dismissal, whether *Ite missa est,* or the less evident dismissal, *Benedicamus Domino* or *Requiescant in pace.* The *Placeat* and the blessing are medieval additions to the liturgy, which originally and logically concluded with the words of dismissal. The last Gospel, whether that of the beginning of St. John or one read as a proper Gospel of the Mass commemorated, is too patently scriptural to be mentioned.

It is not only the text of the Mass, to which, as to the supreme act of liturgical worship, we are now confining our attention, but many of the elements of our public and official cult which are of biblical origin. The observance of Sunday for the liturgical synaxis is recorded in Acts 20:7 and 1 Cor. 16:2. The breaking of bread, so conspicuous a feature of the eucharistic service that it became the name of what we now call the Mass, is the biblical phrase of Lk. 24:35, where the risen Savior reveals Himself to the disciples at Emmaus, and of Acts 2:42, which describes the religious life of the converts of the first Christian Pentecost day. The reading of the Scriptures, as we read the Epistle and Gospel at Mass, is the subject of repeated reference (Acts 3:15; 1 Tim. 4:13; 1 Thes. 5:27; Col. 4:16). Sermons, in explanation of the passages of Scripture read at the eucharistic assembly, are commemorated in Acts 20:7 and 1 Cor. 14:26. Psalms and hymns and canticles, a distinction being made among the three, are recorded as elements of public worship in 1 Cor. 14:26; Eph. 5:19; and Col. 3:16. Examples of primitive hymns are found in St. Paul (Rom. 13:11-12; Eph. 5:14; 1 Tim. 3:16). Evidence is found for prayers for various classes of people (1 Tim. 1:2). Prayers, like those in the Good Friday liturgy, were said with uplifted hands, according to St. Tim. 2:8. The kiss of peace was exchanged among the faithful of the Apostolic age, as we read in 1 Thes. 5:26 and Rom. 16:16. "Amen" was answered to prayers according to 1 Cor. 14:16. The use of "Alleluia" as a prayer of praise is found in Apoc. 19:1,3,4,6. A doxology is furnished us by 1 Cor. 13:13. A whole series of liturgical directions for women in public worship is the subject of 1 Cor. 11:4-5. That there was an Anamnesis prayer in the Apostolic liturgy is a logical deducation from the words of our Lord, "Do this in commemoration of me" (Lk. 23:19), and the expression of St. Paul to the effect that the Blessed Eucharist is a showing forth of the death of Christ (1 Cor. 11:24-26). The existence of prayers involving acts of thanksgiving in the primitive eucharistic synaxis, an idea so prominent that the whole function came to be called a "Thanksgiving," *Eucharistia,* is an evident conclusion from the example of our Lord at the Last Supper, when He gave thanks before proceeding to the consecration of the bread and apparently again before the transubstantiation of the wine (Lk. 23:19 and 1 Cor. 11:24). Indeed, St. Paul explicitly names thanksgiving among the supplications and prayers and intercessions, which are to be made in public worship for all classes of men, from kings and those in high station to all who would lead a quiet and peaceable life in all piety and chastity (1 Tim. 2:1-2).

There is occasional use of apocryphal books of the Bible in the more ancient texts of our liturgy. The most familiar is the Introit of our Masses for the dead, the *Requiem aeternam,* which is repeated in the first verse of the Gradual at such Masses and also freely adapted as the Communion verse. It is a slight variation of two verses of the Fourth Book of Esdras (2:34-35) where we read: "Requiem aeternitatis dabit vobis . . . . quia lux perpetua lucebit vobis." The Introit, *Accipite jucunditatem,* of the Tuesday after Pentecost is likewise from 4 Esdr. (2:36). We have instances of Mass chants, which are based on passages from the Bible rather than being actual quotations from the sacred volume. The example of the Introit for the Feast of the Holy Trinity comes most readily to mind in this connection. "Benedicta sit sancta Trinitas atque indivisa unitas; confitebimur ei, quia fecit nobiscum misericordiam suam," is the text which we read in the Missal, reference being made to Tob. 12:6. No such explicit statement of the Blessed Trinity, however, is to be found in the Old Testament. The words actually found in Tobias are: "Benedicite Deum coeli et coram omnibus viventibus confitemini ei, quia fecit vobiscum misericordiam suam." Similar variations of the exact scriptural text are of occasional occurrence. We have already noted the *Domine non sum dignus* of the Mass, which takes the words spoken by the centurion in Mt. 8:8, substituting *anima mea* for *puer meus* to make the application to the Holy Communion which the priest is about to receive. A Trinitarian variation of Tob. 12:6, similar to that made to suit the text to the Feast of Holy Trinity in the Introit of that day, adapts the Old Testament verse quoted above to read for the Offertory of the same Mass: "Benedictus sit Deus Pater, unigenitusque Dei Filius, Sanctus quoque Spiritus; quia fecit nobiscum misericordiam suam."

The most obvious scriptural portions of the liturgical text of the Mass are the Epistle and Gospel and other lessons, when there are more than these two. Both the New Testament (1 Tim: 4:13; 1 Thes. 5:27; Col. 4:16) and our earliest detailed account of the liturgy, that of St. Justin Martyr in his First Apology (lxvii, 3), addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, about the middle of the second century, bear witness to readings from the Bible as a prominent element of the primitive Christian Liturgy. At first, the number of selections was indefinite. Reading was to continue "as long as time allows," in the expression of St. Justin. Later, the number of lessons was fixed at five, composed of readings from the Law, the Prophets, the Epistles, the Acts, and the Gospel. Later still, the number became three: the Prophecy, from the Old Testament; the Epistle, from some portion of the New Testament other than the Gospel; and the Gospel. This was the arrangement which prevailed up to the late seventh century, since which time our present number of two lessons, the Epistle and the Gospel, has been the rule. This was not universally true, however. The Würzburg Lectionary of the eighth century, for instance, still provides for three lessons. Nor is the number two entirely unvaried today. The Saturdays of the Ember Weeks have seven lessons, including the Gospel, except the Ember Saturday in September, which has six. Three lessons are prescribed for the Ember Wednesdays, the Wednesday of Holy Week, and Good Friday. The first portion of the Good Friday liturgy, often called the service of the three lessons, it may be remarked, is the most faithful survival of the primitive Mass of the Catechumens preserved in the liturgy of the present time.

It is generally agreed that originally the volumes of the Sacred Scripture were the actual service books of the Church, from which the lessons were read directly, the reader beginning at each synaxis where he had left off at its predecessor. When the passages to be read became fixed into the pericopes, as the sections to be read came to be called, marginal notes indicated the beginning and the end of each selection. It was an easy step from this to the compilation of a guide, called variously *comes, liber comitis,* or simply, *Capitularium,* giving the initial and concluding words of each lesson, in order to facilitate the finding of the passages to be read as lessons. When it was no longer the custom to read the Scriptures at Mass in continuous sequence, but to make selections from them to serve as lessons, as we do today, the text of each pericope was copied out to form a special book for the use of the lector, who no longer read from the Bible directly. This book became known from its contents as the *Lectionarium.* Many such medieval collections of Scripture reading for Mass are still extant, like the Würzburg Lectionary and the *Lectionarium Gallicanum,* which is that of Luxeuil.[1] The practice survives to the present of using, for the convenience of the deacon and subdeacon at Solemn Mass, books of lessons, known as the *Evangeliarium* and *Epistolarium.*

The arrangement of our Missal today shows little trace of the continuous reading from Sacred Scripture, which was the order in the primitive and early medieval Church. The liturgical Gospels are selected with considerable *à propos* to the feast or season of the year for which they are prescribed, but the Epistles to a less degree suit the occasion on which they are appointed to be read, and there is often no relation between Epistle and Gospel. We have in the Mass no such chronological order as that of the Breviary in the Scripture readings. Not even in Masses designed for a long series of Sundays, like those after Pentecost, where there is no special event or mystery of the life of our Lord to influence the selections, is there any logical sequence of Epistles and Gospels. When such a series is begun, it is frequently interrupted. There is a fairly progressive order of the Psalms for the Introit of these Masses, but there are many gaps, and after the September Ember days, the Psalter yields to other books of the Old Testament. The Epistles of St. Paul are rather consistently read in the Masses of the season between Pentecost and Advent, but the Gospels show no sequence, chronological or ideological. St. Luke is the Evangelist most frequently read, but the story of our Lord weeping over Jerusalem is assigned to the Ninth Sunday, the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican to the Tenth Sunday, and the parable of the Good Samaritan to the Twelfth Sunday, though the first named belongs to the last weeks of the public teaching of Jesus, and the two parables are narrated by St. Luke in inverse order to their appearance in the Gospel of the Mass. Ingenious but generally unconvincing theories have been advanced to account for the lack of chronological progression in the Epistles and Gospels, which were admittedly originally read in consecutive order. Father S. Beissel, S.J.,[2] accounts for the disturbed order by the assignment to great feasts, introduced into the cycle of the ecclesiastical year, of Scripture lessons selected to accord with the feasts and so breaking the sequence of the original continuous readings. Sometimes, also, the nearness of a feast to a Sunday determined its Gospel. That for the Fourth Sunday after Pentecost, which is often close to the feast of SS. Peter and Paul and is marked in the old Sacramentaries, *Ante Natale Apostolorum,* has as its Gospel the account of St. Peter's miraculous catch of fish, though this story, in St. Luke, antedates by ten chapters the Gospel of the previous Sunday. The last discourse of our Lord, following the institution of the Holy Eucharist, because of its frequent references to the departure of Christ that He might send the Paraclete to His Apostles, though pronounced on Holy Thursday, is obviously most appropriate for the Sundays between Easter and Pentecost, on which it is read, beginning with the Third Sunday. Curiously enough, even here the order of the sacred text is not followed. The portion read on the Third Sunday is from John 16:17-22, while that for the Fourth Sunday is from 16:5-14. The Fifth Sunday resumes where the Third Sunday left off, and the Sixth Sunday, that within the Octave of the Ascension, takes its Gospel from that portion of our Lord's discourse recorded in the Gospel before the text appointed to be read on the Third Sunday (Jn. 15: 26-27; 16:1-4). The lack of systematic sequence, either forward or backward, has rendered the *raison d'être* of our order of Epistles and Gospels a moot question, which no amount of erudite research has been able to solve with any degree of satisfaction.

---

[1] 9427, *Bibliothèque Nationale.*

We have restricted the matter of this brief study to the scriptural elements of the text of the Mass, the liturgical act *par excellence.* Applied to the Canonical Hours and to the ritual for the administration of the Sacraments, the biblical element will be found predominant in the former and subordinate in the latter. The Breviary is so obviously scriptural, with the Psalter as its axis and the compendious reading of the Bible as the principal component of the lessons of the First Nocturn, that the percentage of the sacred text is too high for interesting study.

---

[2] *Entstehung der Perikopen des Römischen Messbuches,* Freiburg 1907.

The scriptural content of the Ritual, however, will, on investigation, prove to be of surprising magnitude. Not only are the verbal forms for the administration of the Sacraments frequently of New Testament text or of adaptations of it, but many of the ceremonies employed have scriptural warrant. Passing over the patent examples of Baptism and Holy Eucharist, the laying on of hands in Confirmation and in Ordination is commemorated in Acts, 8:15 and 19:6, and in 1 Tim. 4:14 and 2 Tim. 1:6. The unction of the sick, with the prayers for his spiritual and bodily health, is the subject of Jas. 5:13 ff. The laying on of hands, incident to this anointing and prescribed elsewhere in the Ritual in the order for the visitation of the sick, is the fulfillment of Mk. 16:18, *Super aegros manus imponent et bene habebunt,* and a repetition of what our Lord was asked to do in the case of the daughter of Jairus, when He raised her to life: *Veni, impone manum tuam super eam et vivet* (Mt. 9:18). The ceremonial for the administration of Baptism is replete with rites of scriptural origin. There are breathings upon the subject, as the risen Savior breathed upon His Apostles on Easter day (Jn. 20:22), many times the laying on of hands, an action so often mentioned in the New Testament, and the touching of the ears and nostrils of the child with the thumb of the priest moistened with saliva, while the word *Ephpheta* is pronounced, the self-same action and word employed by our Lord, when he cured the man who was deaf and dumb (Mk. 7:35). Unexpected as is the frequency of rites of biblical source in the conferring of the Sacraments or the administration of the Sacramentals, we have naturally nowhere in the Ritual such a series of actions, taken directly from the pages of the New Testament, as in the Consecration of the Mass, when the priest, as he pronounces the words of the sacred text, performs the actions which they express, in conformity with the example and precept of Jesus Christ in the first of all Masses at the Last Supper, *pridie quam pateretur.*

WILLIAM J. LALLOU, S.T.D.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE POLITICAL THEORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

A specific political theory, more or less clearly expressed, can be discerned in the Gospels and Apostolic Writings of the new Testament. If the Christian State of the Middle Ages was on its external side a fusion of Teutonic and Roman institutions, engineered largely at first by Cassiodorus and St. Isidore of Seville, and later by St. Boniface and Alcuin and his successors, nevertheless the fusion was definitely set in the doctrinal framework of the teaching of the Fathers, and this teaching in its turn was little more than a development of what they found in the New Testament.

It is important, therefore, to establish just how far New Testament political theory was new in the world, inasmuch as it differed from contemporary Hellenic, Roman, and Judaic conceptions of the civil power. It will be found, I think, that the differences are much greater than are admitted by such writers as Troeltsch, Carlyle, and McIlwaine.

I. The Background

The teaching of our Lord and His Apostles on man's relations with the state and its government cannot be understood without a previous reference to both the political and the theological background of their position.

On the political side, we have, first, the Jewish tradition of kingship, which had its origin in the person of King Saul, and its ultimate human source in the desire of the Jewish people to be free of a direct theocratic rule (1 Kgs. 8:5ff). Secondly, there was the almost universal conviction that God would restore the temporal political independence of Israel in the person of the Messias, descendant of David. Thirdly, the loss of political freedom by the Jews had not diminished among them either this hope or the desire to be free. Fourthly there was, in the midst of the Jewish people of Palestine, the presence of the armed might of Rome itself, keeping the people in subjection. And finally, there was the consequent division among the Jews between those who collaborated with the Roman bureaucracy and those who were more or less openly in revolt against it. Constant agitation against the occupation flared out sporadically in actual revolutions, which were bloodily repressed and inspired the Roman rulers to extreme suspicion of any innovators.

On the other side, Jesus Christ was a descendant of David, and He openly proclaimed that He was the Messias (Jn. 4:26, etc.), with the consequent expectation on the part of His followers, right up to the end, that He would restore the Kingdom of Israel by some kind of divine intervention (Acts 1:6). At the beginning of His life, the angels proclaim to the shepherds a Savior, who is the Lord Messias (Lk. 2:11), and at its end, He frankly confesses to Pilate, the Roman governor, that He is a king (Lk. 23:3) and promptly avers that His kingdom is not "from hence" (Jn. 18:36), that is, has no human origin.

At the same time, whatever apprehension His claims might have caused the Roman authorities, they were not particularly calculated to raise undue hopes among the Jews. It was a universal religion that He preached, not an exclusively Jewish one. "I say to you that many shall come from the east and west and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into the exterior darkness" (Mt. 8:11-12).

Along with its universality, the kingdom of God has a strict unity. To the gentiles, Christ preached the Jewish doctrine of one God, who is the Father of all men, and before whom all men are equal. Humanity, which had been divided by a multiplicity of gods, will henceforth be united under one divinity. To the Jews, Christ preached this same Fatherhood of God, but He extended it to all men: "Other sheep I have that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" (Jn. 10:16). There shall, then, be one community, destined to gather all men into its bosom, and the polytheisms of the outer world shall melt into this unity. Its binding force shall be love, which embraces all men, regardless of race, into its universal sway, and the pride, prejudice, and suspicion, that had hitherto separated men, shall disappear. Truth itself shall be the exclusive possession of this one living body, through which alone all men will come to God.

Along with this, Christ preached also to the gentile world the Jewish doctrine of the supreme dignity of the human person: a being with an other-worldly destiny, a child of Almighty God, with an immortal soul. Man's interests lie principally in the other world, but they are achieved by the use of the things of this world. Hence there will be a duality of operations in the new community.

As a result of this, Christ's followers were keenly aware that they were to constitute a new people. Both St. Paul and St. Peter (Rom. 9:25; 1 Pet. 2:10) quote the prophecy of Osee: "I will call that which was not my people my people" (Os. 2:24). It is not surprising, therefore, that the Christian world was to conceive of itself as having a temporal political existence comparable to that of the Jews in their golden age. And this conception, of course, was tempered by the knowledge of the constant teaching of our Lord that His kingdom was from within, that is, of the spirit (cf. Jn. 4:23).

With this as a background, we can now contemplate the actual teaching about the political society as we find it in the New Testament.

II. THE CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION

The natural starting point is that incident in which our Lord was personally challenged by the Pharisees concerning His allegiance to the occupying power. On a previous occasion, the receivers for the Temple tax had approached the Apostles, and asked: "Does not your Master pay the didrachma?", and when Christ was queried about it by Peter, His answer ended with these cryptic words: "Then the children are free." However, not to scandalize the Jews, Christ paid the tax money miraculously retrieved from a fish's mouth (Mt. 18:18).

On this later occasion, it was a question of paying the Roman tax, a much more serious matter. The Pharisees thought to catch Christ in somewhat the same position of claiming exemption from the civil authority represented in the taxing power. Instead, they handed Him an opportunity to enunciate the real inwardness of the Christian Revolution. Taking a denarius offered Him, He asked: "Whose image and superscription is this?" When they answered, "Caesar's," He promptly replied: "Then render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Mt. 22:21).

Now the parallel between Caesar and God, putting them, as it were, on an equal footing of our obligation to them, is sufficiently striking. Moreover, Caesar stands in the sentence for all political power, and the name has become in all literatures a synonym for government. So Christ's words were interpreted by all the Fathers of the Church, with the exception of Origen and St. Hilary, and possibly St. Ambrose.[1] Caesar stands for all political authority as such, not merely the Emperor who happened to sit at Rome at the moment. Thus Christ endowed the authority of the state with a moral power, binding our consciences, as our obligation to God binds us. This is the real meaning of the collocation of Caesar with God.

What are "the things that are Caesar's"? Christ does not say, but it is obvious that they are not merely the taxes. Here, too, the meaning is a universal one. He is talking of two different spheres. Caesar's sphere would be all temporal matters and God's would be the spiritual, though not for that should Christ be understood as saying that the temporal is not also subject to God. Caesar is merely made its immediate administrator, as will be made clear by St. Paul. When Christ stood before Pilate, He explicitly said to him: "Thou shouldst have no power against (or, upon) Me unless it were given thee from above" (Jn. 19:11). It is true that Pilate's was only a delegated human power; and also that Christ might have been speaking primarily of the divine providence which had delivered Him into Pilate's hands. But the words can also have a universal meaning, and it is in this sense that the Church has interpreted them. The power of Caesar is God's power, however unjustly at times it may be used.[2]

But the raising of Caesar's power to a divine level was not the only mission which Christ had, and accomplished by these words. The revolutionary thing about them was that He separated the two powers into two different spheres. In every people before His time—Egyptian, Persian, Jewish, Greek, Roman—the two powers were identical. Religion and the state were not only parts of the same thing (as they will be again in the Middle Ages) but they were the same thing. The real Christian Revolution lies in the fact that Christ separated them.

This separation did two things: it established as part of the Christian religion the separate autonomy of the political authority, but, more important than that, it denied to the state any control over man's relations with God, in a word, over his religion. Yet Christ does not destroy the state. On the contrary, He raises it to a higher plane than it enjoyed before. In its own sphere, it has an authority that can bind man's conscience in the name of God.

---

[1] Origen, *Comm. in Matth.* tom. 17, nn. 25-28; MPG 13, 1420; Hilary, *Comm. in Matth.* c. xxiii, 2. MPL 9, 1045; Ambrose, *Expos. in Luc.* IV, 73. MPL 15, 1718.

[2] Cf. Augustine, *Expos. in Rom. Prop.* LXXII-LXXIV. MPL 35, 2083-4.

The principal revolutionary step accomplished by Christ's mission was, therefore, the emancipation of the soul. No longer would the state be empowered to direct man's relations with his God, as in the past. The sphere of these relations was to be outside the competence of the state altogether. This new teaching was to be quickly undestood by the Roman authorities. In their persecution of the martyrs for treason to the state, the indictment was to be the refusal of the Christians to submit to the religious authority of the state, not its political authority, which they freely recognized; in other words, their refusal to acknowledge that the religious and political authority of the state were one and the same thing. Thus the martyrs literally died defending a doctrine of the separation of the Church and State

When St. Paul takes up this question in his Epistle to the Romans (Rom. 13:1-7), the emphasis is slightly different. We find him insisting chiefly on the duty of the citizen to the civil power. The focal point is the state itself, not the relations between State and Church. It is the legitimacy of the political authority which he wishes principally to inculcate and its power to bind the conscience in the name of God as His minister:

> Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God. Therefore he that resists the power, resists the ordinance of God, and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation.
>
> For princes are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. Wilt thou then be not afraid of the power? Do that which is good and thou shalt have praise from the same, for he is God's minister to thee, for good. But if thou do that which is evil, fear; for he bears not the sword in vain. For he is God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.
>
> Wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but for conscience' sake. For therefore also you pay tribute. For they are the ministers of God, serving unto this purpose. Render therefore to all men their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.

Upon reading these words, one is prompted immediately to speculate as to what prompted St. Paul to insist so strongly on the duty of civil obedience. After all, the power to which he is subjecting Christians is a pagan one, which for a long time to come will persecute them, and to this power he is attributing a divine origin. Moreover, for three centuries disobedience to the political power will continue to be the outstanding characteristic of Christians. Why, then, was St. Paul at such pains to stress the other side of the picture? It is possible, as St. Jerome suggests,[3] that he wished to warn against the Judaizers, who were still expecting the overthrow of Rome and the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. On the other hand, the explanation offered by St. Augustine[4] seems more porbable: namely, that St. Paul wished to forestall a Christian anarchism based on our Lord's and his own teaching on Christian liberty, and that he chose the church of Rome itself as the most appropriate place to plant this warning.

His teaching could not be more direct and unmistakable. Even the Christian has a duty of conscience to "be subject"—not only to obey, as St. John Chrysostom[5] remarks—and the basis of this subjection is our subjection to God Himself, whose authority is borne by the secular state, even when it is a pagan one. In exercising this authority, indeed, the secular ruler is a "minister" of God.[6] Even in civil affairs, then, no man is called upon to obey another man. When we obey a ruler, we obey God, not man. It is the *thing* that we obey, not the person, as Chrysostom again notes.[7] Hence it makes no difference whether a ruler be a Christian or not. His authority is divine, even if he himself be a scoundrel. Modern writers hold that this proposition is *de fide*.[8]

The "higher powers," then, are the secular rulers. Subjection to them cannot be avoided by interpreting them as "angelic powers or invisible princes," as St. Irenaeus[9] tells us some attempted to do in his time who were infected by Gnosticism. It is to these higher powers that we pay such a prosaic and material thing as taxes. Nor is Origen's attempt[10] to evade political subjection any happier, when he attempts to make St. Paul mean that only the "soul" is to be subject, namely, that part of us which is tied to the material, but not the spirit, and hence only those who live by the soul are subject, but those who live by the spirit, that is, all true Christian, are free.

---

[3] Jerome, *In Titum,* 3. MPL 26, 626.

[4] Augustine, *Expos. in Rom. ibid.*

[5] Chrysostom, *Homil. in Rom.* Hom. 23. MPG 60, 616.

[6] It is interesting, but perhaps not important, to note that the Greek words for "minister" used by St. Paul in vv. 4 and 6, are διάκονοι and λείτουργοι, which in classical Greek meant public servants, but in Christian literature were to put on a definitely ecclesiastical meaning. Cf. Liddell & Scott, and Zorell, in vv.

[7] Chrysostom, *Homil. in Rom., ibid.*

[8] Cf. Suarez, *Defensio Fidei,* Lib. III, cap. 1.

[9] Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses,* Lib. V, cap. xxiv, n. 1. MPG 7, 1180.

[10] Origen, *Comm. in Rom.,* IX, 25-30. MPG 14, 1180.

The passage, then, is universal in its application. It does not refer merely to the Christians of Rome in their special circumstances, but to everybody, everywhere, at all times. Moreover, the passage is utterly silent concerning the legitimacy or illegitimacy of any given political power; this silence will cause difficulty later when that question becomes important. As far as St. Paul is concerned, every secular power is to be obeyed, even when it commands unjustly. St. Augustine[11] goes so far as to say that the meaning of St. Paul is that "it is necessary that we must be subject by reason of this life, not resisting even when they attempt to deprive us of any of those temporal things over which they have been given power." The unjust king is to be obeyed, even by the good.

It will also be remarked that the ruler of whom St. Paul speaks is essentially the possessor of a coercive power. He exists primarily to terrorize the evil man into obeying God's law. To the good man he is not a "terror," for the good man obeys anyhow, "for conscience' sake." It has often been noted that historically no Christian writer ever theorizes about a form of rule beyond that particular one which he himself has experienced, and St. Paul is no exception. Only much later in the Christian era will our modern concept of the ruler as existing primarily to direct wills to the common good be introduced. For the time, the Church was left with the teaching that the ruler is sent for the correction of the bad and the trial in virtue of the good.[12] The Christian people could do nothing but suffer injustice in silence, as a punishment for its sins.

The only exception to this obedience to a bad king occurs in the case where the bad ruler commands his subjects actually to do something positively against their conscience. Here the words of our Lord bidding His followers to render to God the things that are God's were imperative. These in turn are supplemented by the saying of St. Peter before the Council in Jerusalem that "we ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). It is true that in their context these words do not directly apply to civil government. But they are susceptible of a universal application, and so the early Church understood them.[13]

---

[11] Augustine, *Expos. in Rom.* LXXIV, MPL 35, 2084.

[12] Cf., for instance, Augustine, *De Civitate Dei,* IV, 4. MPL. 41, 114.

An interesting variation of this interpretation is offered by St. Augustine.[14] He points out that even in conscientious disobedience there is no derogation to St. Paul's universal injunction. We are not really disobeying, he says, we are merely obeying the "higher power," just as we do in temporal affairs. We really obey the Emperor when we disobey the consul who commands something contrary to what the Emperor commands, and so on down the hierarchy. Thus, whatever St. Paul meant by it, the word *higher* in the course of time will acquire a definitely relative meaning, thus affording a complete rule of conduct in the case of clashing authorities.

But the Pauline directions go even farther than this. They gave rise to a theory on the origin and nature of the political society, one which dominated the mind of the Church for many centuries, until it was overturned by St. Thomas Aquinas. It is important, therefore, to explain this interpretation of St. Paul at this place. I have already remarked his insistence on the purely coercive nature of authority as he knew it in his time: "Princes are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil... If thou do that which is evil, fear, for he bears not the sword in vain ... an avenger to execute wrath upon him who does evil." By this interpretation of which I speak, political authority is not a result of the natural law, as we hold now, but a result of sin.[15] By nature all men are equal.[16] It was not intended that man should dominate over man, but only over the irrational creation.[17] It was as a result of sin that authority came into the world, a punishment of God over fallen man.[18] Its whole intent was, in case he did not fear God, to deter him from evil through fear of man, and to punish the evildoer. "Because of our depravity there was need of government," as St. John Chrysostom put it succinctly.[19] Or, to put it in modern theological language, political authority comes from God not by His decree creating man, but by His decree over fallen man.

---

[13] Cf., for instance, Basil, *Moralia,* Reg. LXXIX, 2. MPG 31, 859.

[14] Augustine, *Sermo* LXII, 8. MPL 38, 420.

[15] Cf. Augustine, *Quaest. in Genesim,* I, 153. MPL 34, 590; *De Civitate Dei,* XIX, 15. MPL 41, 643.

[16] Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Job,* XXI, 22. MPL 76, 203; *Regula Pastoralis,* II, 6. MPL 77, 34.

[17] Augustine, *De Civitate Dei,* XIX, 15. MPL 41, 643.

[18] Augustine, *ibid.* p. Gregory, *ibid.*

[19] Chrysostom, *Sermo in Genesim,* IV, 2. MPG 54, 596.

Did St. Paul, if this Patristic interpretation of him is correct, derive this notion of authority from the Stoics? It has been the fashion of modern non-Catholic writers, following Carlyle,[20] to state that his was an essentially Stoic notion. The Stoics postulated a golden age of innocence in which there was no authority, because there was no need of it, for all men were equal, and equally good. Government came in as a sort of convenience, and was a purely conventional, instead of a natural, institution.

Now there is a similarity between that doctrine and this interpretation of St. Paul. But, first of all, St. Paul and the Fathers knew that there was no political society before the sin of Adam. Their conception of original sin, moreover, itself gave a complete reason for authority arising in society simultaneously with the existence of political society itself. Equality, therefore, was an equality of nature, not of fact, as it was with the Stoics. Besides, the only government known to St. Paul was a coercive government. This was quite in accord with his general teaching that law is for the evil man, not the good, who does good without the necessity of law. When, later, in connection with this interpretation, St. Thomas holds that there would have been authority if man had remained in the state of innocence, he introduces the needed distinction between dominative and directive government, and says that the second but not the first would have existed if Adam had not sinned.[21]

The parallel passage in St. Peter's first Epistle is about the same (1 Pet. 2:15-17). We are to be "subject to every human creature[22] for God's sake," namely to "the king as excelling," or to "governors as sent by him for the punishment of evildoers and the praise of the good." St. Peter's given reason for this, however, is administrative rather than theological. He wants us " by doing well to put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." Hence we are to obey "as free" men, though not for that reason are we to "make liberty a cloak for malice." His thought is definitely not anarchist.

---

[20] Carlyle, *Medieval Political Theory in the West*, I, 98.

[21] *Summa Theologica*, I, 96, iv, in c.; *In Lib. Sent.* II, dist. xliv, art. 3.

[22] The Authorized Version has "to every ordinance of man," reading κρίσει for κτίσει, which seems to me to make better sense; but the MS. authority is weak.

III. CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

These words of St. Peter open up another question which is closely connected with Christian political thought, that of Christian liberty. Two statements of our Lord might at first sight seem to teach that no political authority was to be exercised among Christian peoples. The first has already been mentioned. When the matter of paying the didrachma came up, our Lord said to St. Peter: "What is thy opinion, Simon? The kings of the earth, of whom do they receive tribute or custom? Of their children, or of strangers?" St. Peter answered, "Of strangers." So Jesus said: "Then the children are free" (Mt. 18:18). Is Christ here preaching a doctrine of complete emancipation of His followers from the political authority? Those who later held this did not notice that there was here no question of His paying the state tax, but the Temple tax, which had no political significance at the time. The reference to the king and his children is a parable: just as no king collects taxes from his children, so I do not have to pay the tax for the upkeep of My Father's house.

In the other case, our Lord was admonishing the Apostles who were wrangling over who was to be the greater in the Kingdom. The incident is related in all three Synoptics, with little variation. In Matthew our Lord is reported as saying: "You know that the princes of the gentiles lord it over them, and they that are the greater exercise power upon them. It shall not be so among you, but whoever shall be the greater among you, let him be your minister, and he that will be the first among you shall be your servant" (Mt. 20:25-27; cf. Mk. 10:42-44; Lk. 22:25-26). Does this mean either that Christians are absolved from civil obedience or that in a Christian state there would be no political authority?

There have always been some who give the passage that interpretation. But, as a matter of fact, Christ implicitly declares that there would be rulers and subjects. What He calls for is that the rulers ("the greater," "the first") be the servants of their people, for they are to exist for their benefit alone. A free man is he whose ruler is his servant, a slave is he who is servant of the ruler. Thus St. Gregory was to be able later to say to the Emperor Phocas: "This is the difference between the kings of the gentiles and the emperors of the Roman commonwealth, that the kings of the gentiles are lords of slaves and the emperors of the Commonwealth are lords of free men."[23] As a matter of fact, our Lord in these words was forecasting the whole political theory of the Middle Ages, which held that the whole reason for a government was the common good of the members of the community.[24] "He shall be your servant."

---

[23] Gregory the Great, *Epistola* XXXI. MPL 77, 1282.

There is no doubt, however, that the New Testament abounds in references to liberty. Twice St. James speaks of Christianity as "the law of liberty" (Jas. 1:25; 2:12). St. Peter, quoted above, speaks of our obedience to human authority as free. And St. Paul constantly uses the word:

> Now the Lord is a spirit; and where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty (2 Cor. 3:17).
>
> We are not the children of the bondwoman, but the free (woman), by the freedom wherewith Christ has set us free (Gal. 4:13).
>
> For you, brethren, have been called to liberty (Gal. 5:13).
>
> You are bought with a price; be not the bondslaves of men (1 Cor. 7:23).
>
> All things are lawful for me; but not all are expedient (1 Cor. 10:22).
>
> Stand fast, and be not held again under the yoke of bondage (Gal. 5:1.)
>
> Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to be judged before the unjust, and not before the saints? (1 Cor. 6:1).

Taken by themselves, and out of their context, and applied to civil government, all these passages together might seem to constitute a charter of absolute freedom and point to the abolition of political authority as an immoral institution. And that is exactly how they have been interpreted by a long line of Christian anarchists, beginning with Origen through the Donatists, the Spirituals, the Albigensians, the Anabaptists, the Doukhobors, down to the Jehovah's Witnesses of our own times. Taken each by itself, however, these passages melt away into either a declaration of religious independence of the Old Law, but not of any law; or an exhortation to be free of the tyranny of the flesh and to live in the spirit; or to obey, not because of the law, but out of willing love; or, as in the case of 1 Corinthians, to settle disputed matters among themselves, not scandalously in the open courts, a legislation that had no universal significance.

As a matter of fact, St. Paul practised the obedience to political authority which he preached. When he stood before the Governor Felix, and later before his successor Festus, one of the accusations against him was that he was disloyal to Caesar, even as it had been made against Christ Himself before Pilate (Lk. 23:2; Jn. 19:12-16). St. Paul's answer was a general denial and the appeal to Caesar (Acts 25:9-12). He was a Roman citizen, and he used this fact to escape from his Jewish opponents, it is true, but his very appeal was itself an implicit acceptance of his conscientious subjection to the civil authority and of its legitimate moral power. This was quite consistent with what he had written to the Romans a couple of years before.

---

[24] Cf. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., "St. Thomas Aquinas and Popular Sovereignty," *Thought*, XVI (1941), pp. 473 ff.

The accusations against the Christians at Philippi and Thessalonica, related in Acts 16 and 17, also carry a political meaning. "They preach a fashion which it is not lawful for us to receive or observe, being Romans" (Acts 16:21). "These all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, Jesus" (Acts 17:7). Since St. Paul was present on both these occasions, it is not likely that the Christians of those places were adopting a Christian anarchism. It is definitely implied, on the other hand, that the refusal of the Christians to submit their religious consciences to the civil power had a great deal to do with the trouble that was stirred up against them. Both incidents were more than enough for St. Paul to think of writing to the Romans as he did, in his anxiety to have them realize their conscientious duty to the government in its just demands.

Nevertheless, at the bottom of all this discussion of liberty, there does remain a profound truth. Christ did call His followers to liberty, a liberty of the soul in the face of the political authority. It is of the very essence of Christianity that political government has no ultimate jurisdiction over the conscience and the inner relations of the soul with God, and the martyrs died by the thousands in defense of this freedom. There remained another freedom to be conquered by the Church, the freedom of the body from injustice in temporal matters; but that will take centuries of struggle and discussion. As far as the New Testament was concerned, the Church was left for ten centuries with but the two guiding posts: the separation of the two functions that rule the spiritual and the temporal, and the injunction to obey the temporal ruler as the minister of God.

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J., PH.D., S.T.D.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

NOTES ON THE LATIN TEXT OF THE BOOK OF WISDOM

The current Latin text of the Book of Wisdom is one of the most attractive heirlooms that we have from the early Latin-speaking Christian church of North Africa. In origin it might easily be Jewish; but it has been the accepted rendering in the western Church of this particular inspired book from before the time of St. Cyprian of Carthage (d. 251) till our own day. The Church uses it in her liturgy to honor the martyrs; and in the age of martyrs, these very words were on the martyrs' lips. Even from a purely linguistic standpoint, it would be a fascinating document; for it is an extremely painstaking rendering, into an extraordinary Latin dialect, of a Greek original to which it stands reasonably close in time. The original text, for its part, provides at present remarkably few serious textual difficulties, and forms a quite adequate basis for studying how the translator did his work. Since portions of the New Testament also are preserved to us in Latin from the same general milieu as that in which Wisdom's translator worked, and since textually far more difficult books—in particular, Ecclesiasticus—share a similar origin in their Old-Latin form, a critical edition and related studies of "Wisdom" in Latin would shed a new light on biblical and patristic materials hardly second to that provided by a better knowledge of St. Jerome's renderings from the Hebrew.

There have been textual studies on the Latin of "Wisdom," and even the hoped for critical edition may be in prospect; at least twice, materials have been gathered to that end. There is no intention, in the present paper, of merely rehashing work already done by Reusch, Thielmann, and de Bruyne;[1] or of anticipating in any offhand way conclusions that must be built on careful collations of thus far unpublished materials. But in the light of what has been published, in studies by those named, and in Lagarde's edition of the Amiatinus for Wisdom, there is much worthy of note that can be said about the Latin text, both as to its original form where that is clearly recoverable, and as to its form in the official Clementine Vulgate. The last commentator to devote serious attention to the Latin text of this book was

---

[1] Cf. the bibliography at the end of this article. Commentaries on Wisdom, which anyone can locate readily, are referred to by the writer's name; where no page is given, the verse of Wisdom involved will serve to identify a passage.

Cornely; but even he, for the state of the text, depends in the main upon Reusch, and has made no use of Lagarde's Amiatinus edition. A careful sifting of the available materials in view of the projected revision of the Old Testament in English has made possible the following observations.

1. The Latin "Plus." To begin with, it should now be definitely asserted that however helpful it may be for the critical study of the Greek text, the Latin preserves for us no authentic line or phrase of any length that is not extant in the Greek. Double translations there are in plenty, with a moderate sprinkling of evident glosses and expanded readings; but no more. The last cases to merit serious consideration were in 1:15 and 2:8-9. In the case of 2:8-9 of our Clementine text, Cornely surprisingly fails to indicate that the line "nullum pratum sit quod non pertranseat luxuria" is not a completely separate sentence from that which follows, but only an alternative rendering. The only difference between the Greek which underlies the line quoted, and that which furnishes the following "nemo nostrum exsors sit luxuriae" is the difference between ἡμῶν, "nostrum," and λειμών, "pratum." De Bruyne's evidence (p. 111) includes important codices which give the first rendering and do not have the second. Slender as the testimony to λειμών is, it can be affirmed confidently, with de Bruyne, that the duplicate rendering in this case is the second line, and that the first rendering is a valuable witness to the correct Greek reading rather than to any additional material. Of the recent commentators (even including Fichtner) it is strange that none adopts this view categorically; Gregg's characterization of the reading behind "nemo nostrum . . ." as "somewhat pointless" is even an understatement.

To the other case (1:15) in which even recent commentators have been inclined to discover Latin evidence for an authentic line lost from the Greek, de Bruyne devotes a page (133) favoring on the whole the authenticity of the line. The words in question are "injustitia autem mortis est acquisitio," found in the Sixtine Vulgate and in some MSS., mostly Spanish in origin. De Bruyne admits that the evidence in Latin is slender, in Greek and in the other versions non-existent. For the Greek MSS. this is no insuperable objection, perhaps; but that the ancient versions other than the Latin fail to show any trace of such a line is most damaging. The dubious Latin line has perhaps profited most from having a very facile "retroversion" into Greek which springs to mind almost automatically for those acquainted with the LXX and with the Greek N.T. It is furnished explicitly by Grimm, *ἀδικία δέ θανάτου περιποίησίς ἐστιν.* That such an additional line would fit appropriately into its present context has been often both affirmed and denied. One consideration worth mentioning, however, is that the viewpoint expressed in verse 16 is not that the wicked acquire death, but that death acquires the wicked. It is in the Latin only of verse 12 that one is warned not to "acquire destruction"; the Greek in that place says, "Do not draw to yourselves destruction," which is quite different. Death is represented as a personality, with whom the wicked make a contract; the wicked experience death (2:24) but they do not possess it. To this exegetical difficulty may be added the unlikelihood of Wisdom's speaking in 1:15 of a *θανάτου περιποίησις* when in 1:13 it has been said of God, *θάνατον οὐκ ἐποίησεν.* This would involve an obscure and unsuitable play on words. Heinisch and Fichtner do well to treat the passage as a gloss; and Heinisch skillfully indicates its probable origin.

2. Doublets and Glosses. Though the above are the only instances in which the relation of the expanded Latin text to its original merits serious attention, among the other glosses and doublets are a number worthy of remark. For 2:17c, (cf. de Bruyne, p. 106), St. Cyprian is not a good witness to its redactional character, as he omits also verse 18 which follows; but the *de duobus montibus,* edited with St. Cyprian's works, (Appendix, ed. Hartel, p. 111) does give 17b and 18 together.[2] In 5:6, where Cyprian omits "(sol) intelligentiae," this glossing of the original text was probably suggested by the *φῶς γνώσεως* of Osee 10:12, LXX. The verse 5:14 of the Latin becomes manifestly a gloss when it is traced back to "Talia dixerunt et peccaverunt" (de Bruyne, p. 115). This duplicates the conclusion given in 2:21a to the earlier speech of the wicked. From the variant language in the Latin of the two places ("peccaverunt" would here mean "erred") it may be supposed that the gloss had a Greek counterpart; but the line in 5:14 is hardly from the pen of the original Latin translator, to judge by his use of "peccare" elsewhere. In 5:22, "exterminabuntur et ad certum locum insilient," the two verbs form a doublet; the "et" is to be dropped

---

[2] De Bruyne, p. 107, cites "labores illius" as the original reading in 5:1. His use of small capitals, his apparatus of variants, and the discussion, p. 109, show this to be a slip for "labores illorum."

according to the MSS. (de Bruyne, p. 112). Dom de Bruyne refuses to credit the assertion of Thielmann (pp. 267-8) that "exterminabuntur" here has the extraordinary meaning of "shall be directed to a terminus." But to insist on the normal meaning, "shall be destroyed," for a verb which in the Latin of Wisdom renders ten separate Greek verbs (Thielmann, *ibid.*), makes no sense at all in this place.[3] Moreover, de Bruyne himself provides the aptest of illustrations for the meaning he rejects. In 16:11, for "examinabantur" he furnishes the undoubtedly correct original reading "exacuminabantur" (p. 117). This is built up from "acumen" used as an equivalent for "aculeus," the sting of an insect. And "exacuminabantur" means "stung"!

The sort of section-heading which has become 6:1 of the Latin text is normally attributed, in cross-references, to Prov. 16:32 and Eccles. 9:18 (*sic*). It has to do with neither, but is a rendering of Prov. 24:5 in a form somewhat at variance with both LXX and MT, though closer to the former. Eccles. 9:16 is pertinent, as a possibly intentional paraphrase of the same verse of Proverbs. The quotation from Augustine given as a parallel to this verse of Wisdom (cf. Lagarde, *ad loc.*) is a more literal rendering, doubtless the Old Latin, of Prov. 24:5 LXX. It is odd that Wisdom has a more self-consistent and more cogent form of this text than any extant form of Proverbs. In Wis. 7:16, "scientia et disciplina," the former word is a doublet of the latter, intended to render more clearly ἐπιστήμη. Compare 8:4, where the same Greek word is rendered by "disciplina" alone.[4] In 16:19, "undique," lacking in Amiat., is a corrupt doublet of "ut iniquae."

No matter how carefully the surviving MSS. and citations may be sifted, it is to be expected that a number of glosses and doublets will remain. The Clementine edition has freed us from one such, by omitting from 12:27 an additional "In his enim quae patiebantur moleste ferebant," which, according to de Bruyne (p. 113), is found in all extant MSS. Others of the sort which remain in the received text are, in 6:5, "justitiae"; the verse 6:23, a variant on 6:22; 8:11c, a doublet for the preceding line (de Bruyne, p. 112); in 15:3, "justitiam et." In the present state of the evidence, a complete explanation for the current, related readings in 4:1 and 12:1 (de Bruyne, p. 114) is not possible. But the second of the two can be accounted for almost *in toto* by an accident in its own context. The true original reading is "Bonus enim spiritus tuus est in omnibus," attested by St. Augustine. The superfluous words are "O quam .... et suavis, Domine." The preceding line ends with, "Domine, qui amas animas." The evidences of dittography are unmistakable.

---

[3] A comparison of 5:22 with 5:12 and 18:15 will show how unlikely is de Bruyne's supposition that the Latin writer here grossly misconstrued his original.

[4] Thielmann, p. 257, gives a less suitable explanation for Wis. 7:16.

3. Verse form. For the stichometric arrangement of the Latin text, the better editions (Gramatica, Hetzenauer, that of Desclée) are quite satisfactory. The following points may be noted. In 5:3-4, only Gramatica reads, with the Greek, "et in similitudinem improperii, nos insensati!" The rest begin a new hemistich with "Nos," which upsets the balance of both verses. In 10:6, only Hetzenauer reads, "fugientem descendente igne in Pentapolim" as one hemistich. Placing "fugientem" with the preceding line, as is done by the other editors, again disturbs the thought-sequence. In 13:15-16, Hetzenauer and the Desclée edition both divide properly, but the latter punctuates badly. Omitting, with Amiatinus, two superfluous uses of "et," the lines should read:

> et faciat ei dignam habitationem,
>   in pariete ponens illud, confirmans ferro;
> ne forte cadat prospiciens illi,
>   sciens quoniam non potest se adjuvare.

De Bruyne is led by paleographical considerations into the affirmation (pp. 102-104) that the Latin translator of Wisdom had no intention of writing verse; his description of the original as being itself part prose is unacceptable. No one would suggest that the MS. tradition, both in Latin and in Greek, has not passed through a period, perhaps even a very long one, when stichometric arrangement was not observed. But Wisdom was undoubtedly written for stichometric recitation, and the present-day division of the Greek text does that fact no more than justice. That the Latin translator understood this purpose in his original is rather proved by the numberless cases where he has matched that original line for line without disturbing the general order, than upset by the comparatively few cases wherein he has failed to reproduce that order. There are occasional variations of word-order in the Latin rendering, but they almost always remain within the hemistich. De Bruyne offers four passages to show the absence of any verse-division in the Latin. Of these, 5:3-4 has been discussed above; 18:17 involves a false reading in the Greek of codex B, and the Latin supposes the correct reading and the correct division. In 16:17-22, the division in the Latin (Amiatinus) is not really very faulty. Since the verse-form in the Greek depends on sense-lines, and not on any system of numbered syllables or accents, the Greek lines vary a good deal in length. In translation, some of the lines become too short and are therefore run together. Also, in 16:22 occurs one of the places in Wisdom which is obscure for the Latin translator; since he falls short in his rendering, he fails also to fill out one of the lines. Despite these facts, of the eighteen divisions in the Greek, thirteen are matched by existing divisions in Amiat.; three more of the Greek divisions can be restored by simply dividing lines of Amiat. in two, with no further rearrangement needed. De Bruyne's fourth example, 14:18, is the only verse in Wisdom which the present writer, having the Greek stichometric division before him, could by no means duplicate stichometrically in English. The Greek division is not unsuitable; but only by some amount of inversion can the lines be understandably translated, and the Latin writer obeyed this necessity.

4. Transposition. In the Latin text of Wisdom, transpositions of entire lines play some part. Obvious ones are in 2:3-4 and in 12:12, where the Greek has presumably the correct order. In 11:5-9 of the Latin text, which verses are by exception a very poor reflection of the Greek, a generous share of the blame for the existing obscurity can be attributed to a transposition. There can be little doubt that the original translator of verses 5-6 understood them correctly. Even allowing for the explanatory gloss "a defectione potus sui," we find a passable rendering of the original in:

Per quae enim poenas passi sunt inimici illorum
(a defectione potus sui)
per haec, cum illis deessent, bene cum illis actum est.[5]

The additional insertion in this verse, in the Clem. text, "et in eis cum abundarent, filii Israel laetati sunt," corresponds to nothing recognizable in its present place. For its wording, there has been a violent attempt to find some point of attachment in the context, as is shown by the variant readings "in eo cum ...," "in ea cum ..." "et cum ..." (Amiat.)—cf. de Bruyne, p. 112. For verse 7 there is to be noted only that it amplifies a misunderstood text, to give the material equivalent of the Greek *ἀντὶ μὲν* ...... *αἵματι λυθρωδεῖ.* Verse 8 of the Latin should therefore correspond in a material way to *ταραχθέντες* (*sic*) ... *ἀνελπίστως*. The final hemistich, "dedisti illis abundantem aquam insperate" is entirely satisfactory. Its subject, however, is certainly and unmistakably the Israelites, and the Latin translator could not have been ignorant of this. As the preceding line in the Latin now reads, however, it forces us to understand that the Egyptians, "cum minuerentur," were given the water. There is, moreover, no Latin equivalent to *διατάγματος*, not even a conjectural one. Since he has filled out everything else in the context into a plausible sense, it would be surprising if the Latin writer found no way of working this word into his pattern. The solution seems to lie in transposing the extra line from verse 5, as follows:

---

[5] It is just possible, since "Per haec enim" at the beginning is lacking in Amiat., that "a defectione potus sui" represents a reading, less suitable than the extant text, διψῶντες instead of δι' ὧν. This does not affect the argument given above.

> Qui cum minuerentur in traductione infantium occisorum,
> et [ipsi?] cum abundarent, filii Israel laetati sunt.

It can not be maintained that this is either exceptionally good Latin, or anything like a serious translation of the Greek. But the lines complement each other, and each helps to suggest how the other was arrived at, in a way which indicates that they belong together. The translator who could get "cum minuerentur" out of *ταραχθέντες* or the like could, certainly, and very likely would, get "cum abundarent" out of *διατάγματος*. "Filii Israel" in early Greek MSS. would need only four letters, $\overline{\Upsilon\mathrm{I}}$ $\overline{\mathrm{I}\Lambda}$· And the translator who could render *αἵματι λυθρωδεῖ* by "humanum sanguinem" and have enough left over for "dedisti injustis" (11:7), would have little difficulty in supplying "laetati sunt" in the following verse; in verse 9, "tuos exaltares" is the same sort of expansion. It is also a characteristic of forced translations that they tend to repeat, in the translator's language, similar terms in close proximity, thus betraying confusion. Such are "dedisti injustis" and "dedisti illis"; such would also be "cum abundarent" and "abundantem aquam." In both cases only the second term would have any real warrant in the text.

5. Divergent readings from the Greek MSS. We may also mention two cases wherein the Latin suggests a reading at variance with the Greek text as we have it. In 2:19 the Latin "reverentiam" clearly calls for a Greek reading *εὐσέβειαν* in place of the

current ἐπιεικίαν. We may compare 10:12, where εὐσέβεια is rendered in the current Latin by "sapientia"—with a considerable likelihood that "reverentia" may once have stood in this place also. Goodrick's commentary, on Wis. 2:19, points out the awkwardness of the reading ἐπιεικίαν and calls for another to explain the Latin. There is reason for supposing εὐσέβειαν to be the genuine original text. In 7:21 the "improvisa" of the Latin has been linked (Cornely, p. 265) with the ἀφανῆ of a citation in Eusebius. The connection between the two becomes far more patent if the reading in Amiatinus (Lagarde) has any value. This gives "invisa," with "pro" inserted in small letters above the line.

6. Inner-Latin variants. Of variant readings in the Latin which involve neither doublets in the Clementine nor a variant original, we may note the following, in the order of their occurrence in the book itself. In 6:25, read with Amiat., "quoniam ista non erit particeps sapientiae," with "ista" referring to "invidia" in what precedes. "Talis" of Clem. was at first a corruption of "ista"; and "homo" was added to make it intelligible in some way. In 7:12, de Bruyne's evidence for "quoniam antecedebat ista sapientia," with "ista" accus. pl. neuter, confirms an assertion of Thielmann (p. 261).

For 9:17-19 (LXX 18) there is satisfactory evidence that the Latin translator originally provided a good rendering; cf. Cornely. This first rendering must be reconstructed as,

Sensum autem tuum quis scivit, nisi tu dedisti sapientiam,
et misisti spiritum sanctum tuum de altissimis,
Et sic correctae sunt semitae eorum qui in terris sunt,
et quae tibi placent didicerunt homines,
et per sapientiam sanati sunt.

Thus all the tenses were originally perfect indicatives except in the two relative clauses built out of τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς and τὰ ἀρεστά σου. The occurrence of present tenses within a question referring to past time formed an initial difficulty. The tendency after "nisi" to read "et si" for "et sic" added another problem. For this latter error, a parallel occurs in 17:15, where Thielmann (p. 242) rightly reconstructs a primitive reading "deinde sic quisque," where the sound combination (*c* before *q*) would tend to obscure "sic" in pronunciation to "si"; in our present verse, before "correctae" the same condition obtains. As for 9:17, this with its "nisi" was soon transformed into a question referring to present or future time, with two subjunctives for its protasis. In 9:18, once "et si" was read, there began the effort to make all the verbs subjunctive. The citation of this latter verse in *de singularitate clericorum* (Cyprian, ed. Hartel, Appendix, 190-91) shows the beginning of the process, with only "didicerint" having given way. The ensuing distortions led even to the addition of an entire hemistich at the end, to give some meaning to the sole remaining perfect indicative, "sanati sunt." In the Amiatinus, both verses are already entirely transformed, with only "scivit" still unchanged (Clem. "sciet"). Lagarde, in editing Amiat., says that the copyist meant his "scivit" for "scibit" and counts it against him as a mistake!

In 10:2, the oft-cited variant "de limo terrae" for "a delicto suo" surely arose in the first place from a corruption of "delicto" to which "terrae" was added in recollection of Gen. 2:7. De Bruyne's attempt (p. 112) to trace it to a divergent Greek original is unfortunate. In 12:5 the Latin should come closer to the current Greek than it does in Clem. With Amiat., omit "et" before "filiorum"; read also "devorationem et sanguinis" (cf. de Bruyne, p. 116). In view of the obscurity of the original of this verse, the correct reading of the Latin is of special importance. In 12:7, taking into consideration the plural form of "perciperent," it seems likely that with Amiat. (*vs.* Lagarde) we should accept "digni" as the subject. In any case, "peregrinationem" would seem to have been meant by the translator in the sense of "place for colonization," and thus to be the equivalent of "terra"; so that the latter is a grammatical slip, conceivably original, for "terram," occasioned by the awkward position of the word after its qualifying relative clause. In 12:17, where Amiatinus reads "et hos qui sciunt audaciam traducis," the reading should be accepted as authentic (again despite Lagarde). "Traducere, traductio" in Wisdom are clearly used for "reprove, reproof"; compare 11:8 and Thielmann, p. 252. The double accusative would be a loose extension of the normal Latin construction by which one says, "Me id accusas."[6] In 12:19, the reading "justum esse et humanum" can be rightly understood even without omitting the "et" (as Cornely does). It means, "the just must be also humane." In 12:26, Thielmann (p. 251) argues for "correpti," but without backing his correct reasoning with the evidence of Amiatinus. In 14:11, de Bruyne's evidence (p. 117) for an affirmative reading, "erit respectus," obviates the need for rationalizing the current Latin as Cornely does; the original translator clearly understood "respectus" again in 19:14 as a visitation not of mercy but of punishment. In 14:15, "quasi" is to be omitted with the Amiatinus; read "faciens" with de Bruyne (p. 117) and understand "colere coepit" as a rendering of the ingressive aorist (Thielmann, p. 272). De Bruyne's explanation of "hic error" in 14:16 as a gloss, "There's a mistake here!" is no doubt right; and Lagarde's emendation of "custodita" (Amiat.) to the masculine form only makes an awkward text downright wrong. In 14:24, de Bruyne supplies evidence for "per insidias," which Thielmann ("per insidiam," p. 257) had alleged without support. The corruption to "per invidiam" is very likely to be explained from association of this verse with Mk. 15:10. In 14:27, where the Latin uses "initium" to render ἀρχή, properly "source" (cf. also 12:16), the word "causa" has been transposed to bring "initium et finis" together.

---

[6] Cf. Kühner-Stegmann, Ausführl. Gram. d. lat. Sprache,^{2} Hannover, 1912, II, 303 (No. 73, Anmerk. 9).

In 15:8, both Lagarde and Cornely regard the reading "labore vano" as primitive for κακόμοχθος. Rather, Amiatinus is correct in reading "vanum deum," wherein μάταιον is represented by "vanum." It is of course not impossible that the verse read primitively "cum labore vano vanum deum fingit"; a similar reading is the primitive "qui haec constituit fortia, fortior est illis" (13:4, cf. de Bruyne, p. 108). But the rendering by "vanus" surely grew out of μάταιον, and Amiat. is not wrong on that point. In 15:9, omit "et" after "sed"; so also in 15:12. Both are lacking in Amiat.; the translator, following his original, secured a climax by the use of "sed" alone in each of the two sentences. In 15:19, it seems likely (cf. de Bruyne, p. 117) that the reading began as "Sed nec, aspectu, quis aliquod ex his animalibus bona (*sic*) potest concupiscere." In connection with 16:1 and 16:4, the supposition of Thielmann (p. 251) that "extermino" here is for an "extormino," the equivalent of "extorqueo," deserves serious consideration, especially in view of the astonishing similar formations discussed with 5:22, above. De Bruyne (p. 111) will allow for "extermino" only its ordinary meaning, wherever it is used. The word order of Amiat. in 16:4, "illis quidem sine excusatione supervenire interitum" is far less misleading than Clem. as to the reference of "sine excusatione" to "interitum" as its modifier (in the original, "inexorable want"). In 16:14

Amiat. has an expanded reading, "(occidit) animam suam," which is to be explained from 1:11, where "occidit animam" occurs. In 18:22, the Amiatinus reading "vexatorem" seems more likely than Reusch's "punitorem" (*apud* Cornely).

7. A Jewish Translator? Already in connection with de Bruyne's treatment of 14:16, we have encountered a quite ungrammatical text which there is reason to refer to the translator himself. In the later chapters, where the original sometimes becomes involved and obscure the Latin rendering may be said to include about one 'howler' per chapter—cf. de Bruyne (p. 131) on 16:23 and 17:20. Perhaps, as suggested above, 12:7 and 15:19 belong in this same category. The fact that the translator's difficulties seem, as already in 1:7, often to involve the neglect, abuse, or wrong rendering of the neuter gender makes one reflect how natural this would be if he were of Jewish or Punic origin. The aptness of some of his rather free renderings (12:23, 13:2) where Old Testament thought is involved, and his general faultlessness in reflecting the many O.T. allusions which the Greek text contains, would seem to settle the matter in favor of a writer Jewish by origin at least.

8. Help from the Amiatinus. The following series of more original readings for the Latin text is to be secured from a use of the Amiatinus alone. 1:9, ad Dominum. 3:13, quoniam felix sterilis incoinquinata. 4:1, immortalitas est enim in memoria illius. 4:8, sensus hominibus. 4:15, omit 'est.' 5:24, omit 'illorum.' 11:25, omit 'aut fecisti.' 12:2, admonens alloqueris. 12:13, nec enim. 12:22 misericordiam (omit 'tuam'). 12:26, ludibriis increpationis. 15:10, omit 'enim.' 16:13, Tu enim vitae et mortis. 17: 1, omit 'Domine.' 17:17, omit 'arborum.' 18:6, omit 'enim.' 18:9, percepturos. 18:13, tunc cum fuit exterminium. 18:18, omit 'mortis.' 18:20, ira (omit 'tua'). 18:25, omit 'autem.' 19:9, omit 'escam.' 19:17, Unde est [aestimare] et ex ipso certo visu. To these we may add another class of readings, also taken from the Amiatinus. These are noteworthy in that while they are in fact correct and original, Lagarde in his footnotes has rejected them as errors, in favor of the received text. Such are, 14:4, omit 'mare.' 14:20, multitudo autem adducta. 16:8, et in hoc autem. 19:14, respectus erit eorum.[7]

---

[7] Lagarde also holds for the originality of certain insertions in the received text which Cornely rightly rejects. Thus with Amiatinus in 3:13, omit "sanctarum"; in 3:7, omit "justi" (cf. also die Bruyne, pp. 106-7); in

All the above have been selected from readings which Cornely does not give at all, or for which he offers a conjecture without MS. authority.

9. The Madrid Manuscript. From the foregoing, one might get the impression that Amiat. is an exceptionally good witness for the text of Wisdom in Latin. It is far from it. Lagarde's total of 247 errors in the book may be far less exact than it sounds, but it is still significant; and some of the most distorted of readings are already at their final stage in Amiat. (cf. with 9:17-19, above). That there are better manuscripts, Dom de Bruyne's material makes abundantly plain. In particular, he provides enough samplings from the manuscript X (Madrid Univ. 31, 10th century) to make an exhaustive collation of its readings highly desirable. For example, in 7:8 it shares with Augustine the reading "honestatem" for "divitias"; in 7:24 with Fulgentius "omnium enim mobilitatium" for "omnibus enim mobilibus"; in 8:13 and in 14:11 only X and D have the highly significant omissions of "praeterea (propterea)" and "non"; in 14:24, with T and E, X reads "insidias" for "invidiam"; in 15:17, only X and Cyprian omit the unwarranted repetition, "cum esset mortalis"; in 16:11 X reads "exacuminabantur" with F only; and in 17:16 X alone reads "eremiae" for "agri." All these readings are necessarily correct; and some of them can by no stretch of the imagination be considered as editorially restored, but must rather be survivals of the genuine tradition. Yet this same manuscript X offers at times another type of reading, which clearly depends on revision in the light of the Greek. Instances are, 4:1, infecunditas; 4:6, dormitionibus; 5:13, habuimus; 14:26, gratiae.

The above considerations are introduced in order to emphasize the fact that what is about to be said of the unique readings of X in 19:4-5 in no way destroys the value of that manuscript as an exceptional witness to the original form of Wisdom in Latin.[8] De Bruyne already (p. 118) classifies the "oblibione mittebat" of X in 19:4 as a correction based on the Greek. For

---

8:3, omit "illius"; in 12:19, omit "judicans." Other cases in which Lagarde's apparatus displays faulty selection have been noted in connection with 9:17, 12:7, 12:17, 14:16, 15:8.

[8] Cf. also de Bruyne's remark (p. 115) on the reading of this MS. for 6:15, where it agrees with a third century citation in *De triplici fructu* against all other witnesses.

19:5, (*ibid.*) he cites the reading of X, "mirabile iter consequeretur," where all other MSS. furnish "mirabiliter transiret." There can be no question but that the original Latin translator had "mirabile iter," as does X; for that is the equivalent of the Greek, and it explains the later reading. But is the correct reading in X a restoration, or the old form preserved? Though not attested by any other MS., the reading in X is witnessed again in the Roman Breviary, in a paraphrase of this verse which serves as the fourth responsory at Matins for the Common of Many Martyrs—"Sancti tui, Domine, mirabile consecuti sunt iter . . ." There can be no doubt that the reading in X has influenced the responsory, and not *vice versa.* "Consequor" in this verse gives no clear sense, and it would hardly be chosen in the construction of a free paraphrase unless it were present already in the underlying text. The word-order of the responsory, and the presence of "mirabile iter" both here and in X, but nowhere else apart from "consequere," point in the same direction. De Bruyne says simply that he cannot accept "consequeretur." As an alternative to "transiret" either by text-corruption or as a translation of περάσῃ, which underlies "transiret," it is indeed unthinkable. But the more common and the correct Greek reading is not περάσῃ but πειράσῃ, "experience," cpr. 2:24. It is this reading which "consequeretur" represents, and accordingly, "mirabile iter" also must be suspected as being a restoration of the text made on the occasion of its revision from the Greek. The seemingly unique character of the reading here discussed might provide a means of localizing and dating the Breviary material mentioned.

10. Peculiarities of Rendering. Much has been said before now of the peculiarities of rendering employed by the Latin translator. These few points may be mentioned in addition. In 14:19, "ut similitudinem figuraret" is a double rendering of τὴν ὁμοιότητα made necessary by the wish to fit "in melius" into the phrase. In 14:23, "deceptio," a poor rendering for "snare," has been chosen for its etymology. In 14:23, ἄγοντες is rendered by three participles, "sacrificantes . . . facientes . . . habentes"; it would not be surprising if the "sacrificia" of this verse once read "sacramenta." Similarly, in 18:21, "proferens" and "allegans" both represent κομίσας, if indeed "proferens" is not merely a corrupted repetition of "properans" earlier in the same verse. In 15:8 and 18:24 the translator adds "quam habebat" to repre-

sent possessive pronouns which the Greek usage does not express but merely implies. In 15:16, δεδανισμένος is badly rendered because of the deponent nature of "mutuor." In 15:18, "his aliis," the "his" is for the Greek article, and has no meaning of its own. In 16:5 and 16:12 we have "etenim," where the full force of both particles, καὶ γάρ, "for indeed," is to be understood.

PATRICK W. SKEHAN. S.T.D.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

De Bruyne, Donatien, O.S.B., *Etude sur le texte latin de la Sagesse,* Revue Benedictine, 41, 1929, pp. 101-133.

De Lagarde, Paul A., *Die Weisheiten der Handschrift von Amiata,* in Mittheilungen, I, Göttingen, 1884; (for Wisdom, pp. 241-282).

Reusch, F. H., *Observationes criticae in librum Sapientiae,* Freiburg i. B., 1861.

Thielmann, P., *Die lateinische Uebersetzung des Buches der Weisheit,* Archiv für latein. Lexicogr. u. Grammatik, 8, 1893, pp. 235-77.

EXPOSITION OF THE MISSAL EPISTLES FROM ROMANS

The following passage from Romans is the epistle for the Eighth Sunday after Pentecost:

> 8:12 We are debtors, not to the flesh, that we should live according to the flesh, for if you live according to the
> 13 flesh you will die; but if by the spirit you put to death the deeds of the flesh, you will live.
> 14 For whoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the
> 15 sons of God. Now you have not received a spirit of bondage so as to be again in fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption as sons, by virtue of which we cry,
> 16 "Abba! Father!" The Spirit himself gives testimony
> 17 to our spirit that we are the sons of God. But if we are sons, we are heirs also: heirs indeed of God and joint heirs with Christ...

In this passage there are two distinct sections. The first is a solemn warning to the faithful to live a spiritual, not a carnal, life (vv. 12 and 13). The second is the beginning of the Apostle's treatment of the faithfuls' glorious privilege as adopted sons of God and heirs of heavenly glory (vv. 14-17).

The solemn warning is connected with what goes before by *therefore,* and is thus the corollary of what St. Paul has been discussing for several chapters, and more particularly of what he has stated in the immediately preceding verses of this same chapter. In the sixth chapter the Apostle tells the Romans that they are dead to sin but alive to God in Christ, and that consequently they are not to yield their members to sin as weapons of iniquity nor as slaves to the master Sin. This is another way of saying that they are not to live according to the flesh.[1]

Then St. Paul depicts the tragic struggle between the law of the members, i.e. the flesh, and the law of the mind. Unaided by the Savior's grace fallen man is foredoomed to failure in this contest, but with the supernatural reinforcement of grace—which God is ever ready to impart to all who humbly cry to Him for it—success is assured.[2]

---

[1] This passage has been discussed in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* October 1941, III, no. 4, pp. 349-355 and January 1942, IV, no. 1, pp. 51-57.

[2] This has been discussed in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* April 1942 , IV, no. 2, pp. 146-151.

In the verses immediately preceding the present lesson St. Paul writes that the faithful have no fear of condemnation, for they have been delivered from the helplessness that was theirs prior to the gracious work of rescue effected by our Savior. Indeed the Spirit of God dwells in them and because of the dignity they thus enjoy their bodies are to rise to a glorious immortality. St. Paul does not here specify the time of this resuscitation; he expatiates on that point in 1 Cor. 15. To share in this glorious resurrection, however, the Christian must live the life of the spirit and abandon the life of the flesh. At this point St. Paul introduces the solemn warning which forms the first part of the liturgical reading for the eighth Sunday after Pentecost.

But before discussing it in detail, it will be helpful to indicate the various senses in which St. Paul uses two words that come constantly from his pen and that he uses several times in our pericope. They are *flesh* and *spirit*. The term *flesh* the Apostle uses in the following senses:

1. *the human body,* as in 1 Cor. 5:3; Eph. 5:28-29, *et al.*
2. *human nature,* as in the expression *flesh and blood,* as in Eph. 6:12; Heb. 2:14; 1 Cor. 15:50.
3. *Concupiscence* or unruly passions which reside principally in the flesh. Thus in the passage under consideration.

The term *spirit* is used in the following senses:

1. *The Holy Spirit,* third Person of the Blessed Trinity. When the term is not qualified, as it frequently is by *of God* or *of Christ,* the context is our only guide in determining this sense. Thus in Rom. 8:16.
2. opposed to the *flesh, spirit* means the spiritual part of man, his mind and will as informed and guided by the grace of God. Thus in Rom. 8:13.
3. the mind of man with some peculiar habit or temper good or bad. Thus in Rom: 8:15: *spirit of bondage, spirit of adoption.*
4. simply the *human mind,* as in 1 Cor. 2:11.

We are debtors, not to the flesh, that we should live according to the flesh.

The flesh here means the corrupt inclinations of fallen nature. It is the indulgence of these sinful inclinations that the Apostle warns against, not the reasonable care of one's bodily needs. We are under no obligation whatever to the flesh in its evil inclinations, for we have been bought at a great price (1 Cor. 6:20).

And our service is due in all justice to Him who has purchased us, not to the insistent cravings of the lustful flesh. Since in Christ all the justified have died and risen mystically with Him (Rom. 6:4), we should live not for ourselves, not for the selfish indulgence of the flesh, but we should rather live for Him who died for us (1 Cor. 5:15).

To live according to the flesh is to indulge its unruly, sinful impulses, to make it the mistress of one's life. The line of conduct it urges is set down by St. Paul in Gal. 5:19: "The works of the flesh are . . . immorality, uncleanness, licentiousness, idolatry, witchcrafts, enmities, contentions, jealousies, anger, quarrels, factions, parties, envies, murders, drunkenness, carousings, and suchlike." Those who indulge such vices, in so far as they do, are to that extent living according to the flesh.

For if you live according to the flesh you will die.

The penalty of such a life is death—not the physical death of the body but the eternal death of the soul in hell. As Chrysostom puts it: "the deathless death, punishment and vengeance in hell." But while this death becomes final and irreparable only in the next life, it has its beginning in this life. It is, in the words of St. Thomas: "the death of guilt here, of damnation hereafter."

But if by the spirit you put to death the deeds of the flesh, you shall live.

According to the best view *spirit* here does not mean the Holy Spirit, but rather the spiritual outlook, habit and temper of mind which has been brought about by the work of the Holy Spirit in one's soul. This work not only includes the gift of faith which completely reorientates man's life and provides him with a new scale of values, but it also includes hope and charity, and the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit which are infused at the moment of baptism when the third Person of the Blessed Trinity becomes the divine guest of the soul. With that equipment man can without too much difficulty put to death the deeds of the flesh. And he must do so if he is to escape eternal death and attain to the eternal life of heaven. This life has its inception, as St. Thomas points out, here below in the life of grace, and since grace is the seed of glory, it will, if it is ours at the decisive moment of death, inevitably flower forth into the life of glory in the world to come.

Origen aptly sets forth how the deeds of the flesh are to be put to death:

> The fruit of the Spirit is charity; hate is a deed of the flesh. Therefore it is extinguished and put to death by love. Similarly joy is a fruit of the Spirit; the sorrow of this world which produces death is a deed of the flesh. This then is extinguished if the joy of the Spirit resides within us. Peace is a fruit of the Spirit; quarreling and discord are deeds of the flesh, but it is certain that discord can be put to death by peace. So also patience of the Spirit does away with impatience of the flesh; goodness crowds out malice, meekness, harshness; temperance eliminates intemperance, and chastity kills immodesty.

For whoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. To be led by the Spirit of God is the same as to live by the spirit and put to death the deeds of the flesh. Those who are so led are the sons of God, and for that reason they shall live forever as God's children in His heavenly kingdom.

Chrysostom here points out that the Apostle does not say *whoever receive,* but *whoever are led by the Spirit,* lest through a confidence in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit which results from baptism the Christians should grow negligent of their conduct and thus lose the dignity and preeminence of adoption. All their life long the baptized must live up to the ideal of holiness inculcated by Christianity. "Not every one who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven, he shall enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Mt. 7:21).

"To be led by the Spirit" means to be guided as by a teacher and director, as a child lets its father instruct and direct it. Commentators remark that this being led by the Spirit in no way impairs the liberty and self determination of the human personality. Sanday and Headlam suggest the analogy of the influence one human being exercises on another. This sometimes rises to great heights without destroying the freedom of the one on whom it is exercised. The divine influence may be still more subtle and persuasive. St. Thomas says that this guidance of the Holy Spirit does not prevent those who submit themselves to it from acting by their own free will, because the Holy Spirit causes the motion of the will and free choice in us as St. Paul declares: "It is God who of his good pleasure works in you both the will and the performance" (Phil. 2:13). St. Augustine comments on this action of the Holy Spirit on the soul as follows: "Some one says to me: therefore we are acted upon, we do not act. I answer: you both act and are acted upon, and you act well if you are acted upon by good. He gives you the name of helper because you also do something. . . . No one is helped if nothing is done by him."

Now you have not received a spirit of bondage, so as to be again in fear.

This harks back to pre-Christian times when both Jews and pagans were dominated in their attitude towards the deity by fear of punishment rather than by filial piety and love. The Jews were, it is true, sons of God, as Chrysostom and Jerome point out, but because they were under the Law as a pedagogue, their attitude towards God was characterized rather by fear than by the loving, generous sentiments of sonship, and although individuals in Old Testament times may have achieved the tender intimacy of filial devotion with God, as for example the author of Psalm 102 (103), the prevailing temper was that of fear. The feeling of the liberty of the sons of God which our Lord introduced was not the common attitude of the Old Testament period. "Timere servorum est," says St. Jerome, "diligere filiorum. They, who were unwilling to act by the spontaneity of love, were compelled by fear."

This attitude St. Paul characterizes as a "spirit of bondage," i.e. the frame of mind which characterizes the slave. The Apostle would not have the Christian lapse again into that state of mind from which the grace of the Savior had rescued them.

You have received a spirit of adoption as sons. As a result of their incorporation into Christ by faith and baptism and of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, who suffuses their minds with filial love, the Christians acquire the assurance that they are God's sons, that He is their generous, loving Father. The resultant state of mind—a free and unrestrained intimacy, a spontaneous and loving confidence, a generous devotion and desire to please and to conform ourselves to our heavenly Father's all wise purposes—this is the spirit of adoption, the state of mind which becomes sons.

This sonship, while it is not natural as is that of our Lord, is more than a mere legal fiction because of the Christian's intimate union with our Lord. In our incorporation into Him at baptism we become members of His mystic body. We stand in the same relation to Him as does the branch to the vine. The soul's supernatural life of grace is the very life of Jesus Christ (Gal. 2:20; Rom. 6:11; Heb. 3:14), and by it we become, so to speak, blood relations of Jesus Christ, and our adoption is much more than a purely juridic fiction. Yet it remains adoption because it is all due to the utterly gratuitous bounty of God.

By virtue of which we cry, Abba! Father!" In the perfect assurance that God is our Father, we spontaneously cry to Him whenever we feel the need of His aid "Father!" But why is the Aramaic "Abba" added? Origen says: "It is as if Paul had said: 'Father! Father!'" The repetition would indicate the intensity of his feeling as in the prayer of our Lord in the garden (Mk. 14:36). St. Thomas thinks that the "Abba" indicates that the Jews were to invoke God as Father, while the Greek indicates that the rest of mankind were to do the same. But more probably the Greek was at first added as a translation of Abba, and then the custom sprang up of using the two terms together that, as Cornely thinks, "by repeating the two terms together the Christians might more clearly indicate their love."

The Spirit himself gives testimony to our spirit that we are sons of God. How does the Holy Spirit bear this testimony? Not by an external voice audible to the ear but by the interior filial sentiment which He imparts to us, that feeling which leads us to pray: "Abba! Father!" So think St. Jerome and St. Thomas. The original Greek rather means that the Holy Spirit testifies *with* our spirit, i.e. with our mind and heart, supernaturalized by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

The certitude produced by the testimony of the Holy Spirit concerning our being in the state of grace is not the absolute certitude of faith, as the Council of Trent teaches. It is, however, moral certitude, which, according to Suarez, can reach the same degree as that which the baptized person has relative to the remission of original sin. Of course there can be no doubt about the utter finality of the Holy Spirit's testimony and consequently of itself it results in absolute certitude, but there is always the possibility of self deception, as Cornely points out, by which a person could falsely persude himself that his own purely subjective assurance originates from the Holy Spirit. This possibility, however, is remote and does not exclude a practical certitude which results in a great calm and peace of soul.

But if we are sons, we are heirs also. The idea of inheritance cannot be strictly applied in this case, for the son does not come into possession of his father's estate until the father dies. That is true, remarks St. Thomas, of material goods but not of spiritual which may be possessed and enjoyed by an unlimited number of persons simultaneously. And Père Lagrange remarks that the term is influenced by the Hebrew *yarash,* which means possession as well as inheritance. The idea of possession seems to predominate.

Heirs of God. St. Thomas pertinently remarks:

> He is heir that comes into possession of the testator's chief goods. But the chief good by which God is rich is Himself. He is rich of and by Himself, having no need, as the Psalmist remarks, "Thou art my God, for Thou hast no need of my possessions." Ps. 15(16) of external goods, and so again the Psalmist says: Thou art the share of my inheritance.

And joint heirs with Christ. St. Paul adds these words because we become sons and heirs only through the redemption effected by our Saviour and by our incorporation into Him through faith and baptism. He is the natural Son, we only by sharing through His gracious and gratuitous bounty in His sonship, and thus we are heirs only by reason of our union with Him.

Here the epistle for the eighth Sunday after Pentecost comes to an end, but St. Paul adds a few significant words which the makers of the liturgy for some reason saw fit to omit:

Provided, however, we suffer with him that we may also be glorified with him. This proviso explains why, although we are brothers of Christ and heirs with Him of heavenly glory, the possession of that blessed state is deferred. We must come to it in the same manner as did our blessed Lord. He is the way, and His way to glory was through suffering. "Did not the Christ have to suffer these things before entering into his glory?" (Lk. 24:26) He suffers with Christ who can say as did St. Paul: "With Christ I am nailed to the cross. It is now no longer I that live, but Christ lives in me" (Gal. 2:19-20). Before entering into the glory of heaven we must fill up in our flesh for his body which is the Church "what is lacking of the sufferings of Christ" (Col. 1:24). This is the royal road of the cross which our blessed Lord opened up for us by word: "If any man wishes to come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me" (Mt. 16:24), and by example, "becoming obedient to death, even to death on a cross. Therefore God exalted him. . ." (Phil. 2:8-9).

Consequently while our adoption as sons came as a purely gratuitous benefit, the entrance into the possession and enjoyment of our heavenly inheritance can be realized only by the lifelong bearing of our cross, which consists in our lot of suffering and self-denial as God sees fit to apportion it to us. We can only hold on to the gratuitously granted benefit of adoption, and enter into our heavenly heritage on condition of living as sons of God by putting to death the deeds of the flesh.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

St. Mary's Seminary
Perryville, Missouri

OBSCURITIES IN THE LATIN PSALTER

XV

87. **Psalm 87:6a.** (Saturday, at Compline.)

Factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio, *inter mortuous liber.*

The text is intact, and the versions, including Jerome's own, render it literally. "Among the dead I am free" is puzzling to us because of a certain social implication anciently attaching to "free." It seems to be that of the "masterless man" in feudal Europe. Being no one's vassal or serf, he has no one more powerful to assume responsibility or care for him. The dead, with whom the Psalmist is not yet numbered, have no attachments or allegiances; he feels unmoored, like them. The simile anticipates the more explicit *quorum non es memor amplius,* which follows in the next verse. One word in English will give the right nuance:

I have become like a helpless man,
among the dead I am adrift.

88. **Psalm 87:11b.** (Saturday, at Compline.)

Numquid mortuis facies mirabilia: *aut medici suscitabunt,* et confitebuntur tibi?

This results from ambiguity in the unvocalized consonants of the earlier Hebrew. The original of *medici* with other vowels would be the participle "healers," and LXX may be pardoned for having read it so, selecting as they did a much commoner word than the real alternative. But LXX followed the Hebrew in other respects, writing "or will healers rise," whereas V, having followed LXX in *medici,* then misread the Hebrew verb as causative: "or will healers raise (them) up." This would be possible with *waw* altered to *yodh,* but not otherwise.

Jerome's own version approaches TM in writing *aut gigantes surgent* [*al. resurgent*]. But *gigantes* is interpretation rather than translation (as when we saw LXX, in Ps. 73:14b, infer that "the folk of the desert" must be "Ethiopians"). The word used as subject of *surgent* in TM is clearly original with its present vowels, which make it "R^{e}pha'im." This is an ancient tribal name denoting a stock of aboriginal dwellers in Palestine whom Hebrew tradition located south and east of Jerusalem (Gen. 14:5;

15:20). It would very well serve a Judean poet for the type of "ancients" nearest at hand in territory, though long since perished. Thus we have

> For the dead dost Thou work wonders?
> Will *the ancients arise* and praise Thee?

89. **Psalm** 88:34b. (Friday, at None.)

Misericodiam autem meam non dispergam ab eo: *neque nocebo in veritate mea.*

The original of *nocebo* is radically "deal falsely." LXX, followed as usual by V, looked at the common purpose of deceit rather than at deceit itself, when both wrote "nor will I injure in my truth." The radical meaning, however, predominates, and makes all plain:

> But My mercy I will not annul from him,
> *nor will I play false in My truth.*

90. **Psalm** 88:36b. (Friday, at None.)

Semel juravi in sancto meo, *Si David mentiar:* semen ejus in aeternum manebit.

The original of *mentiar* ends a metrical couplet, *semen ejus* and what follows it belonging to another. Our point is the curious idiom "if I be false to David"; yet perhaps this is too familiar to most of our readers to call for explanation. When a clause introduced by "if" has no following apodosis, the "if" in Hebrew is usually a strong negative—and "if not" in similar circumstances a strong affirmative. The complete expression in the speaker's mind would probably be the familiar formula of adjuration "May God do so to me, and add thereto, if (I do, or do not . . .)," as we find it in 1 Kgs. 3:17; 3 Kgs. 19:2, and often elsewhere. But where God is the speaker this would be manifestly inept. Here (and sometimes also in human adjurations) the conditional clause stands alone as equivalent to an oath. We are familiar with it in the *Venite exsultemus* (Ps. 94) daily at Matins: *Quibus juravi in ira mea: Si introibunt in requiem meam.* So, in the present passage:

> Once have I sworn by My holiness:
> *Never to David will I be false.*

91. Psalm 88:45a. (Friday, at None.)

Destruxisti eum ab emundatione: et sedem ejus in terram collisisti.

Evidently LXX had a Hebrew text very like our own for this passage; but the originals of *destruxisti* and *emundatione* are both slightly elastic, and each uncertainty affects the other. To begin with the last word, its Hebrew original in TM is a *hapax legomenon* as here pointed, but it stems from a well known and fruitful root, and is taken to mean either "purity," "clearness" or "lustre." It is qualified in Hebrew by the suffix "his." "Lustre" (*claritas*) appears most appropriate to this context, but LXX and V understood "purity" or "purification," and Jerome's version agrees, writing *Quiescere* [*al. deficere*] *fecisti munditiam ejus.*

This reveals the root of difficulty in the original of *destruxisti.* The Hebrew verb is in the causative stem, "Thou hast made to cease," but no direct object of "made" or "caused" is expressed. Since there is no doubt about the preposition *ab* before *emundatione,* the construction seems faulty. Who or what has been "made to cease from his lustre"?

To meet this normally transitive force of the causative stem many moderns supply "him." Zorell thinks of *ab* as partitive, writing in his text *Minuisti splendorem ejus,* and explaining this in his notes as *cessare fecisti* (*aliquid*) *de splendore ejus.* But this intrudes a weak assertion amid a series of strong ones, and seems impossibly out of place when thus reduced to its Hebrew explanation. Bäthgen and Buhl (Bi.) have resolved the last Hebrew word into two by changing two consonants and introducing a third. But this is unnecessary, as is also the supply of *eum* as object of the causative force of the verb.

The fact is that the causative stem of the Hebrew verb is often not strictly transitive in construction. One is said to cause an action without thereby expressing a causative influence upon its agent. Joüon (§54 *e*) observes this fact, and further (§54 *f*) illustrates what he calls a secondary or pseudo-causative function in quite a respectable list of verbs. One may lend us an illustration. In Gen. 1:7 we read that "God made the expanse, and He *effected separation* [causative stem] between the waters," etc. Here the grammatical object of causation is the state of separation; one need not suppose "made the expanse, and caused *it* to separate," although it was the means employed. Similarly in our present passage TM amounts in effect to "Thou hast caused cessation from his lustre," which disposes of the need of introducing "him." We adopt Bird's rendering as best expressing this sense:

Thou hast put an end to his lustre,
and hast hurled his throne to the earth.

92. Psalm 89:9c. (Thursday, at Lauds.)

Anni nostri *sicut aranea meditabuntur.*

This difficult bit of text begins with a question of division. The whole verse in V, which follows LXX as usual, is thus arranged:

Quoniam omnes dies nostri defecerunt:
et in ira tua defecimus.
Anni nostri sicut aranea meditabuntur.

Whereas the division of TM is preserved by Jerome's version:

Omnes enim dies nostri transierunt in furore tuo:
consumpsimus annos nostros quasi sermonem loquens.

Thus LXX took the original of *defecimus* as intransitive (which, without the present vowels, it might be), connected it with *in ira tua,* and introduced *et* before the latter phrase. This division leaves the obscure last member without a verb except its final word, which LXX read as *meditabantur* (imperfect). Its three consonants *hgh* are the radicals of a very common verb meaning "murmur, sigh, speak," or (in poetry) "muse, talk to oneself, meditate," the last quite commonly in the Psalms. But the Massoretic vowels make it the derivative noun "murmur, sigh, speech," and Jerome's version understands this. Beginning, therefore, with the misplaced original of *defecimus,* and making this transitive, he writes (as above), "We consume our years as one speaking a word."

Why LXX inserted *ἀράχνη* before this last word (which they took as a verb) is the difficult question. From Aquila, Symmachus or Theodotion we have no record here, and Syriac has obviously taken its "spider" from LXX. Kittel conjectures that they took the last word itself as the Aramaic for "spider's web." But this leaves no original for *meditabuntur,* unless they translated this last word in two different ways, as if uncertain which was right; and the supposed Aramaic noun is only inferred from Syriac. Schleusner gives three rather involved explanations of other scholars, and then offers as his own preference the conjecture that LXX simply intruded the cobweb as an apt illustration of something fragile and transitory.

Boylan probably has the correct explanation of the textual problem, which had also appeared in *Verbum Domini* (Vol. II, p. 51) two years earlier. It leaves room for something like both *aranea* and *meditabuntur* within the structure of the unpointed Hebrew. At any rate, no one attempts to defend the spider or its web as original. The true reading is probably that of Zorell and Bird; again we borrow the latter's translation:

> For all our days have declined through Thy fury;
> we bring *our years to a close as a sigh.*

93. Psalm 89:10d. (Thursday, at Lauds.)

Quoniam *supervenit mansuetudo: et corripiemur.*

Supervenit is not far from TM, although this reads rather "passed on" than "come upon." Probably LXX occasioned *mansuetudo* either by supposing a word somewhat like the present form, and meaning "be silent" (Schleusner, Bird and others), or an Aramaic word for "mercy" with an exchange of the final sibilant common to the two languages. TM vocalizes it as the adverb "quickly." *Corripiemur* is thought by several to be an early corruption of LXX itself, *παιδευθησόμεθα* having supplanted *πετασθησόμεθα*, "we shall fly away." The Hebrew verb, however, is in perfect tense. Jerome practically follows TM, writing *Quoniam transivimus cito et avolavimus.* Restoring the tense:

> For *it is gone quickly, and we have flown.*

94. Psalm 89:12. (Thursday, at Lauds.)

Dexteram tuam sic notam fac, et eruditos corde in sapientia.

A question of division confronts us first. Is the previous infinitive *dinumerare* the last word of 11, and dependent on *quis novit* in that verse (Bi.), or is it the first word of 12, and complementary of the imperative rendered *notam fac* (Zo.)? Jerome's version favors the latter arrangement. *Dexteram tuam* (LXX-V) may be right, but TM has "our days," and Jerome again agrees. He writes: *Ut numerentur dies nostri sic ostende, et veniemus corde sapienti.* As to this last, *eruditos corde in* *sapientia* seems to Schleusner a periphrastic expansion of the present Hebrew construction on the part of LXX. General opinion accepts TM, and in its division we follow Jerome, with Zorell:

> To number *our days so make us know*
> *that we may acquire a heart of wisdom.*

WM. H. MCCLELLAN, S.J., S.T.D.

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Maryland

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CORNER

JERUSALEM: PALACE OF HEROD THE GREAT

In the summer of 37 B.C., Herod the Great took Jerusalem from Antigonus, the last of the Hasmonean rulers, and began his long reign as King of Judea. He enlarged the fortress Baris into a palatial castle and re-named it Antonia in honor of Mark Antony, through whose influence he had been named king by the Roman Senate three years before. This castle, standing like a sentinel at the northwest angel of the temple enclosure, served as Herod's official residence in Jerusalem for a dozen years. He probably felt safer in it than in the unprotected royal palace of the Hasmoneans in the heart of the city.

About 24 B.C., Herod built for himself a magnificent palace on the highest section of the west hill, a half-mile from the temple. It comprised two very beautiful buildings, which he named Caesareum and Agrippeum in honor of his friends Caesar Augustus and Marcus Agrippus. Each contained spacious banquet halls and numerous guest chambers, all luxuriously furnished. Much of the furniture was of silver and of gold.

The extensive palace grounds were artistically arranged. At the Antonia, because of the limitations of a site hewed out of the hillside, there were practically no palace grounds at all. Here the buildings were surrounded with attractive, colonnaded cloisters, open courts, fountains and gardens. There were also groves of trees and long shady walks. Bordering on the walks were artificial streamlets, and ponds studded with bronze figures spouting water. Here and there were cotes for tame pigeons of which Herod seemed to be fond.

Josephus states that the palace grounds were completely enclosed within a wall thirty cubits high, broken at equal distances by ornamental towers.[1] Possibly the palace grounds may have had their own distinct wall on all sides, but it is more likely that the nearby city-walls served as boundaries of the grounds on the north and west. Herod had strengthened the north wall with three massive towers, and Josephus states that the king's palace adjoined these towers on their inner side. They formed a citadel, not only for the palace, but for the whole upper city as the west hill was called.

The first of these towers, Herod named Hippicus after a friend of whom nothing further is known. It was twenty-five cubits square and solid to the height of thirty cubits. Above this base was a reservoir of masonry, twenty cubits deep, to receive rain-water, while over the reservoir were several apartments one over the other. Topping these were turrets and battlements, the total height of th tower being about eighty cubits. Josephus, in describing the walls of Jerusalem as they

[1] *Jewish Wars,* V. v. 4.

were at the siege of 70 A.D., uses the tower of Hippicus as the point of departure for his narrative.[2] Were we certain of the exact location of this tower, several other problems of Jerusalem's topography would be nearer solution, if not solved.

The second of these towers was named Phasael in memory of Herod's brother, who had been closely associated with him in the civil government of the country when they were both tetrachs. It was the largest of the three and resembled the tower of Pharos at Alexandria. The lower portion was a solid base, forty cubits square and high. Above this ran a cloister, ten cubits high, which was protected by parapets, and from the center of which rose another tower, several storeys high. Its summit was crowned with turrets and battlements, the total height being about ninety cubits.

The third tower, Herod named in memory of his wife Mariamme, the only one of his ten wives whom he really loved. In an insane fit of jealousy five years previously and while he still lived at the Antonia, he had her executed. Remorse overtook him almost immediately, and he grieved for her the rest of his days. This tower was fifty-five cubits high and twenty cubits square. It was solid to the height of twenty cubits. While not so massive as the other towers, it was more ornate in its appointments, a fitting memorial for a queen.

As the three towers were built on the crest of a lofty hill, they seemed to be even higher than they were. They must have been an imposing sight, and Herod, no doubt, felt safe in the palace which they guarded. Very likely, it was in this palace that Herod received the Magi about 4 B.C. or earlier, and issued the decree for the massacre of the innocents at Bethlehem. The decree was in keeping with Herod's ruthless character. Some believe Jesus was brought into this palace rather than into the Antonia to be questioned by Pilate, and that it was at one of the palace gates that he was condemned to death.[3]

After the siege of 70 A.D., Jerusalem was left a heap of ruins. The Antonia had been demolished by the Roman soldiers immediately upon its capture to make way for the assault on the temple fortifications. The temple itself, the palace, and most of the city had been devastated by fire. When the conflict was over, Titus ordered the temple buildings and the city walls to be levelled to the ground, and apparently his orders must have been carried out substantially. Only the three Herodian towers and a portion of the west wall were allowed to remain as a protection for the tenth legion. These towers were finally dismantled by Julius Severus at the time of the Bar Cocheba revolt in 132. When Hadrian re-built Jerusalem as Aelia Capitolina, a citadel was erected on the site out of the materials from the towers and palace. In the subsequent centuries, this citadel was destroyed and restored many times. In its present form, it dates from the sixteenth century. Undoubtedly, there is some re-used Herodian material in its walls. The interesting question is whether any portion of the original palace and towers is to be traced in its foundations, or anywhere in the vicinity.

---

[2] *J. W.*, V. v. 2, 3.

[3] Dalman, *Sacred Sites and Ways*, p. 336; Vincent-Abel, *Jérusalem*, II, p. 565.

As it stands to the south of the Jaffa gate (Jerusalem' only western gate), the citadel still presents an impressive appearance with its irregular pile of salient towers and connecting walls. There are five towers. On the outer side are the northwest and southwest towers, while on the inner or city side are the northeast, east and southeast towers. The northwest tower is popularly known as the tower of David. In 1878, Conrad Schick, a German architect and archaeologist, was allowed to explore and measure the tower of David. He found that in its lower courses, it was a solid structure of immense stones, Herodian in workmanship. From a comparison of its dimensions with those as given in Josephus, he concluded that it represented the remains of Herod's largest tower Phasael.

After World War I, the British removed the dilapidated Turkish barracks from the courtyard of the citadel, and discovered an old wall circling from the so-called tower of David toward the southwest. Evidently the present citadel had been built straddling the remains of this older wall. There were also traces of two salient towers. To determine the nature of this old wall and towers, and their relations to the rest of the structure, the Department of Antiquities began a series of careful soundings in 1934. Although the work was interrupted by the Arab-Jewish troubles and again by World War II, several preliminary reports have been published.[4]

Mr. C. N. Johns, director of the excavations, believes that this old wall which has been traced across the courtyard of the citadel, is a segment of a city wall from the Jerusalem of the first century B.C. It may represent a portion of the wall re-built by Antipater, Herod's father, and strengthened about 24 B.C. by Herod with the addition of three massive towers. Apparently it incorporated some earlier elements from previous fortifications on the site. How early these may be, remains to be determined.

The sub-structure of the so-called tower of David is an insertion into this wall, and the indications are that it is one of Herod's towers, probably Phasael. It consists of sixteen courses and is solid throughout. The upper eight courses are stepped back slightly, the total height of the sub-structure being about 65 feet. The complete tower must have been more than again as high. Although none of the stones are as large as the figures given by Josephus, they are indeed immense. Most of them would weigh from five to ten tons each. They are dressed in typical Herodian fashion, and have been carefully laid. No traces of the other two Herodian towers have been found thus far, nor of the palace. The Mariamme was probably to the east of Phasael. Johns believes that Hippicus was to the north of Phasael, and independent of the walls. The two salient towers recently discovered in the courtyard are definitely pre-Herodian.

---

[4] *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 1940, pp. 36-58 and 8 plates; *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine*, Vol. IX (1941), pp. 207-209.

EDWARD A. CERNY, S.S., S.T.D.

St. Mary's Seminary
Baltimore, Maryland

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

Old Testament

(Historical Books, Archaeology, Hebrew Linguistics.)

American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 58, 1941. John A. Wilson, "The Egyptian Middle Kingdom at Megiddo" (225-36). Publication of an inscribed Egyptian statuette found at Megiddo incorporated into the rubble of a temple-platform. It bears the name and titles of Thuthotep, a known functionary of twelfth dynasty times. This prompts the author to review the tenuous evidence regarding Egypt's foreign relations in the Middle Kingdom period, insofar as it suggests effective Egyptian political or military control in Palestine-Syria at that time. The evidence of the execration texts from Egypt and that of finds from Byblos and Ugarit are still the primary data on this question.

E. G. Kraeling, "The Origin of the Name 'Hebrews'" (237-53). Cites again the growing extra-biblical evidence for a name *'Apiru, Ḫa-pi-ru.* Takes the occasion to review extensively the Old Testament data on the name "Hebrews." Concludes that the usage is not of foreign imposition, but was a designation by which the Israelites spoke of themselves at one time. Suggests that underlying it is a geographical term for the territory across (east of) the Euphrates. This would seem to imply rejection of the connection with *'Apiru,* which Kraeling sedulously avoids.

R. A. Parker, "Persian and Egyptian Chronology" (285-301). Includes a re-examination of the double-dated Aramaic payri from Elephantine, leading to acceptance of the traditional date 522-21 B.C. for the accession year of Darius.

G. G. Cameron, "Darius and Xerxes in Babylonia" (314-25). Reviews the chronological evidence from Babylonian contract tablets on the early years of Darius and the dates of the pretenders whom he suppressed; adds indications that the succession of Xerxes was in every way peaceful, without revolt in Babylonia in his first two years.

J. Garstang, "The Story of Jericho, Further Light on the Biblical Narrative" (366-72). Takes advantage of the lowering of the accepted date for the origin of some Beisan pottery types to discuss the location of comparable material on the site of Jericho. On this slender basis, the article attributes to Eglon, king of Moab, the "Middle Building" at Jericho.

R. A. Parker, "Darius and his Egyptian Campaign" (373-77). Supposes a military expedition to put down rebellion in Egypt, with the departure from Persia fixed in the later summer of 519 B.C. Includes the dated prophecies of Aggeus and Zacharias and the temple-building narrative in Esdras in a conspectus of the events of 522-518 B.C. in Palestine and Egypt.

Anglican Theological Review, 23, 1941. J. A. Montgomery, "Law and Religion in the Ancient World as Illustrated in the Bible" (293-306). Describes the basis of Hebrew law in the concept of God as the final Judge in all cases, the Hebrew sense of right and wrong, the meaning of several legal terms such as *mišpaṭ, ṣédeq*, etc. Outlines the history of the administration of law into the Christian period.

Biblical Archaeologist, 4, 1941. G. E. Wright, "Solomon's Temple Resurrected" (18-31). A popular account of the main features of Solomon's temple, with helpful illustrations, and with many sidelights from Syro-Phoenician sources; it concludes with a compilation of verses from the Prophets and the Psalms which "voice . . . impatience with what was thought to be the priestly non-essentials" of sacrifice.

O. R. Sellers, "Musical Instruments of Israel" (33-47). A handy short description with illustrations and bibliography.

Bibliotheca Sacra, 98, 1941. L. S. Chafer, "Angelology, Satanology, and Demonology" (389-420). Beginning of a series of articles ranging through all references to angels in the Old and New Testaments.

C. L. Feinberg, "Exegetical Studies: Zechariah" (447-58). Discussion of the vision of the candlestick and the two olive-trees; continues an earlier article.

H. S. Curr, "The Intrinsic Credibility of Biblical Miracles" (469-478). Biblical miracles demonstrate their own credibility when carefully considered, by virtue of their very character. There is an absence of the bizarre, and of legerdemain. They are simple, and they "fit in" with the nature of things.

L. P. Moore, Jr., "Prayer in the Pentateuch" (479-88). A study of the prayers addressed to God in the Pentateuch.

Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 83 (1941). W. F. Albright, "The Land of Damascus between 1850 and 1750 B.C." (30-36). The upper date is the presumptive one of the figurines from Egypt with execratory formulae referring to Syro-Palestinian places and princes. Albright announces the publication (at Leyden), by Posener, of this material. Familiar place-names attested for this early time are Sichem, Aphek, Tyre, Jerusalem, Acre, Kubni (Byblos). The personal names include one which Albright vocalizes Aburahana and compares with Abraham. The territory about Damascus appears as *'Apum*, a name known in later form from the Amarna tablets and attested also from Mari; it had one prince named *'Ayyâbum*, that is, Job.

I. Mendelsohn, "The Canaanite Term for 'Free Proletarian'" (36-39). Cf. also E. Lacheman, in *B.A.S.O.R.*, 86 (1942), "Note on the Word Ḥupšu at Nuzi" (36-37). The social status involved in the O.T. word *ḥofšî* is discussed in the light of now widespread extra-biblical parallels.

W. F. Albright, "Are the Ephod and the Teraphim Mentioned in Ugaritic Literature?" (*Bulletin* 83, 39-42). They are not, as is shown by a new analysis of the context (I* AB i, 1-21) in which Virolleaud supposed them to be found. Cf. also, (*ibid.*, 84, 1941) H. L. Ginsberg, "Did Anath Fight the Dragon?" (12-14); and Albright again, "Anath and the Dragon" (*ibid.*, 14-17). The relation of Anath to the slaying of Leviathan is illustrated by a further excerpt, this time from V AB, D, 29-43).

E. A. Speiser, "The Shibboleth Incident (Judges 12:6)" (*Bulletin*, 85, 1941, 10-13). Proposes that the point of the story is based on a pronunciation of the word, not in western Palestine, but in Gilead, as *ṯubbult*^{u}. If the pronunciation with *Šin* were already current in Ephraim, but the older form lingered on in Gilead, it would become a practical and convincing test in the circumstances described. Other explanations fall short by supposing that the Ephraimites were asked to utter a sound which, however out of place in this particular word, would still be a normal phonemic feature of their language which they would be "in a position to duplicate cheerfully."

I. Mendelsohn, "State Slavery in Ancient Palestine" (*ibid.*, 14-17). Palestine, like other ancient lands, will have had three classes of slaves —domestic slaves, temple slaves, and state slaves. These last are found in the passages of the O. T. which speak of the *mas 'ôbed* and of the *'adbê Šelomo.*

W. F. Albright, "Two Cressets from Marisa and the Pillars of Jachim and Boaz" (18-27). Proposes that the two pillars at the front of Solomon's temple were free-standing fire-cressets of metal, with ornamentation based on the Egyptian *djed* symbol of Osiris.

H. H. Rowley, "The Exodus and the Settlement in Canaan" (27-31). Cf. also G. E. Wright, "Two Misunderstood Items in the Exodus-Conquest Cycle" (*ibid.*, 86, 1942, 32-5); and the comment on Rowley's note by M. Burrows (*ibid.*, 35-6). The succession of assumptions and conjectures which surround the confused archaeological data from Jericho, and their relation, if any, to the biblical narrative, continues unabated.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 26 (1941-2), E. Robertson, "Temple and Torah: Suggesting an Alternative for the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis" (182-205). Places the compilation of the Pentateuch in the time and under the direction of Samuel.

Civiltà Cattolica, Anno 92, 1941, I. F. S. Porporato, S.J., "Miti e inspirazione biblica" (276-284; 421-28). Discusses the mythological terms and allusions in the Bible, especially in the O. T. Cf. F. X. Peirce in *Eccles. Review*, 105, 1941, "Recent Bible Study" (65-67).

Expository Times, 52, 1940-41. J. W. Jack, "Recent Biblical Archaeology" (353-7; 454-8). The earlier article discusses Palestinian rains, cereals, plowing, sowing, harvesting; also, with reference to Ezion-Geber, slave labor, the Israelite walls, ostraca, a store-room found there, the extent of trade; also guilds of workmen in the O.T. The later one deals with the threshing, winnowing, storage and grinding of grain; with shipping at Ugarit; with points of mythology having a bearing on the O.T., such as, God's finger, meals before God, struggle with dragons, the winged sun, gods in chariots, ladders to heaven. *Ibid,*. 53, 1941-2, Jack continues the same series, discussing (113-7) Israelite baking methods, Israelite warfare, the deportation under Nabuchodonosor and the life of the Jews in Babylon. A further article (208-12) is on Moabite Jericho under Eglon, Cushan-rishathaim, the Brussels figurines from Egypt, ships of Tarshish, Israelite horticulture.

Harvard Theological Review, 35, 1942. V. Tscherikower-F. M. Heichelheim, "Jewish Religious Influence in the Adler Papyri" (25-44). A discussion in which Tscherikower objects to the editors of the papyri calling the man Horus a "metuens" and argues that "there is no certain proof of Jewish influence upon Egyptians." Heichelheim, one of the editors, thinks that Horus was "probably a gentile who liked to be in Jewish society, to read the Greek translation of the holy book of the Jews and to follow Jewish laws as long as these did not interfere too much with his material and social chances in life."

Hibbert Journal, 39, 1941. J. C. Hardwick, "The Wrath of God and the Wrath of Man" (251-6). "The wrath of God figures largely in the Old Testament, not only in the more savage narrations .... but also in the prophetical books as well as in the Psalms." The N.T., "save in Revelation," is not so "gloating" and "revolting." While today people generally do not read the Bible, still "the public mentality contains a large admixture of biblical ideas"; hence they follow the "wrath method" of crushing evildoers. Hardwick urges a "mature" attitude of "resist not evil." "But certain biblical notions would have to be discarded. . ."

W. Ross, "Jericho and the Date of Exodus" (299-308). A summary and a defense of Garstang's early dating, as set forth in his "The Story of Jericho" against H. H. Rowley's later dating in his "Israel's Sojourn in Egypt."

Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 41, 1941. D. J. Leahy, "Why We Read Old Testament History" (792-8). The O. T. is the history of God's preparation for the coming of the Messias.

K. Carey, "Don't Blame Adam and Eve" (*ibid.,* 42, 1941-2, 714-9). A popular exposition of the theme that even if Adam and Eve had not sinned, their descendants would still have had to make a choice between good and evil.

Jewish Quarterly Review, 32, 1941-2. W. Chomsky, "The History of our Vowel System in Hebrew" (27-49). Takes issue with the assertion of F. R. Blake that "Hebrew systems are all based on the Nestorian dot system and therefore later than 750 A.D." The explanation for ה as a vowel-letter given by Chomsky does not clear up the problems involved. The three vowel systems, Babylonian, Palestinian, Tiberian, are described. Nothing in the sketch militates against a Syrian origin of the vowel system. The *ḥaṭef* vowels are perhaps a device for artificial restoration to the gutturals of a consonantal value generally ignored by even Jewish circles in Palestine in Christian times.

M. G. Slonim, "The Deliberate Substitution of the Masculine for the Feminine Pronominal Suffixes in the Hebrew Bible" (139-58). The list of forms in which this phenomenon occurs (cf. also the author's previous article, *ibid.*, 29, 1938-9, 397-403) is surprisingly extensive and of considerable interest. The author would date the practice to a time later than 400 B.C., and would ascribe it to the original writer of the biblical text at least in the case of Paralipomenon.

H. M. Orlinsky, "On the Cohortative and Jussive after an Imperative or Interjection in Biblical Hebrew" (*ibid.*, 31, 1940-1, 371-82; 32, 1941-2, 191-205; 273-77). In this series of articles, the cases of subordination of an imperfect tense-form (preceded normally by simple *waw*) to an imperative or interjection are examined; and it is found that except in negative clauses or cases in which the subject of the subordinate verb intervenes, the latter verb form will not be a simple imperfect, but regularly a cohortative or a jussive. The construction discussed is well covered in principle in an excellent section of Joüon's grammar, Nos. 116 and 120, on what he calls the "indirect volitive mode."

Journal of the American Oriental Society, 61, 1941. H. M. Orlinsky, "On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies" (81-91). Recalls in the first place Margolis' work on Josue; maintains the recensional unity of the entire Hebrew text-tradition of the O.T., as against Kahle. Maintains also the methodological soundness of research in the LXX based on the principle of manuscript families going back to various recensions of a single rendering. This runs counter to a series of articles by A. Sperber, the latest in *Journ. Bibl. Lit.*, 59, 1940, 193-293. Orlinsky upholds his own position to good effect, and his general thesis commands complete acceptance. That every book of the O.T. was translated into Greek once and once only before Theodotion or Aquila, Orlinsky does not say. This would be the opposite extreme to Sperber's untenable thesis postulating independent rendering everywhere.

Z. S. Harris, "Linguistic Structure of Hebrew" (143-67). An exhaustive description of the structure of Hebrew words and sentences, intended to portray according to phonemic method the characteristic sounds of which the language is composed and the combinations in which they occur. The Jerusalem dialect of c. 600 B.C. is taken as the standard, which means that some of the data employed are inferential rather than direct; but the margin of error will not be great. Descriptions of this sort are of value for, and are directed towards, the student of comparative linguistics.

P. Wechter, "Ibn Barūn's Contribution to Comparative Hebrew Philology" (172-87). An analysis of the surviving portions of "The Book of Comparison between the Hebrew and the Arabic Languages," produced by the Spanish Jew Isḥaq ibn Barūn at about 1100 A.D. It falls into a grammatical and a lexical section, and Wechter calls it "the first systematic and successful attempt to discus sall similarities . . . between the two languages."

T. J. Meek, "Again the Accusative of Time in Amos, 1:1" (190-91). A re-formulation of the principle regarding this accusative given *J.A.O.S.* 61, 1941, 63 f. "'The temporal accusative regularly expresses duration of time, and it can only express point of time when and because movement is necessary to indicate the point of time." Besides Am. 1:1, cases in Gen. 11:18, Num. 13:22, and 1 Kgs. 9:15 are cited.

A. L. Oppenheim, "Idiomatic Accadian" (251-71). A valuable analysis of the idiomatic expressions in Accadian which include reference to parts of the human body. At point after point, these idioms are suggestive of similar usages in O.T. Hebrew, and those cited supplement in a very effective way Dhorme's similar material of some years ago.

Journal of the American Oriental Society, 62, 1942. A. Goetze, "The So-Called Intensive of the Semitic Languages" (1-8). In Accadian at least, the actually occuring examples of intensive forms "can be easily arranged on lines parallel to the various statives." "Hence one can say that the denominative function of the D [intensive] form which is so frequent in all individual languages is the primary force of the form." A category of apparent intensive forms which by exception denote a state of continuous action, and whose nature is thus "irreconcilable with the basic meaning of the stative" is explained by Goetze as constructed not by doubling the middle radical, but by the use of an infix 'n.' Applications to Hebrew are suggested, but not urged.

C. C. Torrey, "Notes on the Greek Texts of Enoch" (52-60). Following the publication of the Greek for the latter portion of this book, Torrey reviews the entire ground to claim for all parts of Enoch an Aramaic original; the delicate, if crucial, test of mistranslation in the extant forms is extensively employed.

Journal of Bible and Religion, 9, 1941. M. Burrows, "Old Testament Syncretism" (10-16). Traces the development of O.T. religion through various stages of modification by, and reaction against, neighboring religions. There was an "oscillation and tension ... between syncretism and puristic reaction." This accounts for the survival and fruitfulness of Judaism.

Otha R. Clark, "The Patriarchal Narratives today" (94-7). They constitute a body of tradition that through the centuries became a "highly composite body of historical recollection mingled with, and variously related to, many elements of myth and folklore. As to the historicity of the patriarchs themselves further evidence will be awaited with interest..."

H. G. May, "The God of My Father" (155-58). The title Yahweh, the God of their (your, etc.) fathers is exilic and postexilic, and is due to exilic Deuteronomic redaction. It occurs only four times in JE (Ex. 3:13,15,16; 4:5) where there may be redaction as late as the time of the Deuteronomist. From a term originally referring to a personal deity (God of my—thy—father) of individuals the title came by fusion and confusion to refer to Yahweh as the one God of the Israelite nation and its ancestors.

Journal of Biblical Literature, 60, 1941. R. Marcus, "The Hebrew Sibilant Śin and the Name Yiśra'el" (141-50). Marcus maintains with Haupt that *śin* is from proto-Semitic 'š'. He proposes that the dissimilation is Amorite, under possible Hurrian influence, and prior to 2000 B.C. He notes that a sibilant not '*s*' or 'š' was treated as a foreign sound at Ugarit, and that Amarna evidence fails to reveal the presence of *sin*, rather suggestin its absence. Amorite origin for עשה as opposed to Canaanite פעל as the verb 'to do,' is suggested. The Shibboleth test in Judges would have been intended to distinguish Israelites from Canaanites, not from other Israelites. After the end of the Hebrew kingdom, *śin* became *samekh*. Iśra'el, Śerâyāh, Śerâyāhu are placed together.

G. A. Barton, "Danel a Pre-Israelite Hero of Galilee" (213-25). Reexamines the possible geographical allusions of the Ugarit texts; accepts "Edom" and "Negeb" in their customary Hebrew meaning also for the "Legend of Keret"; finds Kinnereth, Qadesh in Galilee, allusions to the tribal groups of Asher and Zabulon, and a general location in Galilee indicated in the Danel traditions.

B. A. Brooks, "Fertility Cult Functionaries in the Old Testament" (227-53). An examination of the terms *nethinim, qedesh, zonah, yošébet* (Ez. 8:14), *Ṣ*^{e}*bā'ōth, 'almāh;* a discussion of "sacred offspring," "eunuch priests," and "sacred eunuchs" of early Hebrew religion—in the light of the prevailing preoccupation with fertility cults and their place in the history of religion.

S. T. Byington, "Hebrew Marginalia" (279-88). Terms of Hebrew daily life surviving only in metaphor and simile; constructions with אל; חסד (for "friendship") and the ambiguity of the language of

Hushai (2 Sam. 16:17, cf. 2 Sam. 17:20, also ambiguous). דיה represents a great desert falcon, the lanner or the saker; איה is the kite. Comment on readings in Ps. 27:8; 64:7-9; Prov. 8:12,16; Job 19:26.

Journal of Near Eastern Studies (new title of the *Amer. Journ. Semit. Langs.*), 1, 1942. J. A. Wilson, "Archaeology in Humanistic and Social Studies" (3-9). In archaeology and in related fields, "The time has come to shift our emphasis from structure to content." A plea for presentation by the archaeologist of his scientific data in terms of their over-all significance, and with an interpretation of what they seem to imply, for the benefit of the non-specialist.

J. P. Hyatt, "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy" (156-73). Placing the beginning of Jeremias' public ministry "about a decade after Josiah's reforms of 621 B.C.," Hyatt holds that "The Book of Jeremiah as we now have it has received expansion and redaction at the hands of 'Deuteronomic' editors, whose purpose in part was to claim for Deuteronomy the sanction of the great prophet." He distinguishes between the cultural and the social program enunciated in Deuteronomy, and cites the texts in Jeremias which reject sacrifices as an indication that he could not have approved Josias' reforms. Dates and passages in Jeremias which would indicate activity by the prophet in the time before 621 B.C., or which suppose him to be in close sympathy with the teachings of Deuteronomy, are treated as the results of editing. "In order to understand the true Jeremiah, we must discount the Deuteronomic passages.

W. F. Albright and G. E. Mendenhall, "The Creation of the Composite Bow in Canaanite Mythology" (227-9). Nine hemistichs from the Ugaritic "Danel" texts, with the customary large proportion of forms and concepts akin to biblical Hebrew.

Journal of Religion, 21, 1941. H. G. May, "Pattern and Myth in the Old Testament (285-99). The O.T. narratives were woven according to certain mythological patterns; their historicity must be determined by such factors as parallel references, inherent probability, literary criticism, archaeological data and the like.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1941. A. M. Honeyman, "Canaanite Pronominal Suffixes at Byblos and Elsewhere" (31-36). At Byblos, the 3d. masc. sing. suffix ה occurs after singular nouns in Byblos I; the suffix ו found elsewhere is always after dual-plural or *lamed-yod* singular form. The Jerusalem pronunciation in biblical times will have been not -*ā*(*y*)*w* but -*ēw*. רעו in the Siloam inscription is to be read *reʿēw*, from *riʿáyhu*, in its three occurrences.

Language, 17, 1941. A. Goetze, "Is Ugaritic a Canaanite Dialect?" (127-38). An analysis of specifically "Canaanite" grammatical features as manifested by biblical Hebrew and the kindred dialects, with insistence on the divergence of Ugaritic, which would be "Amurrite" in character. The very enumeration of differences here makes the fundamental kinship of Hebrew and Ugaritic clearer than before, even if we relinquish the "Canaanite" classification for the latter.

Menorah Journal, 29, 1941. M. Radin, "Alexandria of the Jews" (85-101). Semi-popular reflections on the state of the Alexandrian diaspora, making use of epigraphic remains from Egyptian synagogues of Hellenistic and Roman times.

Modern Language Journal, 26, 1942. H. Blumberg, "Increasing Reading Experience in Hebrew" (199-204). Briefly traces the revival of (neo-) Hebrew as a living language, then gives a good outline for teaching Hebrew as a modern language, which can be of help, *mutatis mutandis,* to the professor of biblical Hebrew.

Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira, 1, 1941. P. Jaeschke, "Concordância entre a cosmogonia mosáica e a ciência" (137-42). A resumé of D. Kreichgauer's "Das Sechstagewerk," edited in 1906, in which the attempt is made to show entire agreement between the findings of science and the biblical story of creation.

Theological Studies, 2, 1941. J. E. Coleran, "The Sons of God in Genesis 6:2" (488-509). "The Sethite theory, however, seems the most probable when everything is considered."

Theologische Quartalschrift, 121, 1940. J. Hashagen, "Vorexilische Diaspora" (211-16). Argues for the existence of Jewish colonies outside of Palestine even before the exile.

Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache, 76, 1940. Werner Vycichl, "Ägyptische Ortsnamen in der Bibel" (79-93). A study of the Egyptian geographical names in the biblical text.

Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 94, 1940. C. Brockelmann, "Neuere Theorien zur Geschichte des Akzents und des Vokalismus im Hebräischen und Aramäischen (332-371). The theory analyzed at greatest length is that of C. Sarauw. Studies by Cantineau, Artom, Poebel and Goetze are given briefer notice. The argumentation is largely negative, devoted to showing the unsuitability of Sarauw's system.

Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, 64, 1941. A. Alt, "Herren und Herrensitze Palästinas im Anfang des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr." (21-38). A discussion of the same execratory texts analysed by Albright in *B.A.S.O.R.* 83 (see above).

JOHN P. WEISENGOFF, S.T.D., S.S.L.
PATRICK SKEHAN, S.T.D.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

BIBLICAL NEWS

Article X of the revised By-Laws of the Catholic Biblical Association provides that "The Association shall sponsor a biblical section at the National and Regional Congresses of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine." The first opportunity to give effect to this paragraph of the By-Laws presented itself at the regional meeting of the Province of Cincinnati, April 26-28, in Indianapolis. With the approval of the President of the Association, a program was prepared for a special biblical section at which the Right Reverend Joseph E. Hamill, P.A., Ph.D., was Honorary Chairman and Reverend Aloys Dirksen, C.PP.S., S.T.D., an Active Member of the Association and President of St. Joseph College, Collegeville, Indiana, was presiding Chairman. Three papers were presented: "Bible Study and Bible Reading in the Work of the Confraternity," by Rev. Raymond Stoll, S.T.D., Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Cincinnati; "The Genesis of the Revised New Testament," by Rev. Edward J. Hodous, S.J., West Baden College, West Baden, Ind.; "The Custodian of the Written Word," by Rev. Cyril Gaul, O.S.B., St. Meinrad Seminary, St. Meinrad, Ind. The biblical section was well attended and the interesting discussion that followed each of the papers indicated that this feature of the Indianapolis Congress will carry a wide appeal at future meetings.

The Second Spanish Biblical Week is reported by Florentino Ogara in Razón y Fe, 124 (1941), pp. 250-254. It was held in Madrid, Sept. 22-27, 1941, under the auspices of the "Associación para Estudios Biblicos."

Father Sylvester Saller, O.F.M., of the Franciscan Province of the Sacred Heart, St. Louis, Mo., who for many years has conducted excavations on Mount Nebo, has just published his remarkable findings in "The Memorial of Mount Nebo" (Franciscan Press, Jerusalem). The work has two parts: text and illustrations. Only 500 copies have been printed. It is marked as the first publication of the "Studium Franciscanum Biblicum." We rejoice at the fact that the ancient Custodians of the holy places have found it possible in these days of strife and struggle to present to the biblical world such a splendid exemplification of scholarship and devotion. "Vivant sequentes!"

Father Saller also reports that most interesting and valuable discoveries are being made at Ain Karem. It is expected that some of these findings will settle quite a few of our archeaological problems.

The Sixth General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America will be held on September 1 and 2, 1942 in Cleveland, Ohio under the patronage of His Excellency, the Most Rev. Joseph Schrembs, Archbishop-Bishop of Cleveland. The headquarters of the meeting will be at St. Mary's Seminary, 1227 Ansel Road. The Right Rev. Msgr. James M. McDonough, LL.D., rector of the Seminary, the Right Rev. William L. Newton, S.S.D., and the Rev. Joseph F. Walsh, M.A., procurator of the Seminary, are in charge of local arrangements.

An interesting and profitable program is in preparation. There will be the usual sessions devoted to business and to the reading of especially prepared papers. One session will be given over to a study of the method of presenting the Old Testament as a preparation for the New Testament. Other practical questions in the teaching and study of the Scriptures will be discussed. A full session will be devoted to a discussion of some of the problems in the revision of the Old Testament. Alternate turns of more frequent phrases will be presented, and after discussion voted upon so as to give guidance to the editorial board of the Revision Committee.

The Committee on the One-Volume Commentary has completed its work. The manuscript is in the hands of the printers. The publisher is William H. Sadlier, Inc. The volume will contain about 800 pages, 5 1/2 by 7 1/2 inches, approximately the proportions of the Confraternity edition of the Revised New Testament. The introductory material includes notes on the political and religious background, the parables, and the synoptic problem. In the appendix there will be an extensive topical index and a glossary of terms unfamiliar to the lay reader. The retail price will probably be $1.50; discounts will be given for quantity orders. The book will be ready early in September. Advance orders should be sent directly to William H. Sadlier, Inc., 11 Park Place, New York City.

This commentary will prove extremely valuable to seminarians. It will enable the professor to direct the students in the intelligent reading of the whole of the New Testament, while supplementing the commentary with the more complete treatment of special questions. Priests will find it a ready and practical aid. Discussion clubs studying the New Testament will find in this book the explanations they need for a full appreciation of the Sacred Text.

BOOK REVIEWS

NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D., and RAYMOND STOCK, *A Concordance to the Bible* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1942) Pp. 1255. $7.50.

The attitude of looking askance at American Catholic scholarship is still not infrequently found in certain European circles. Essays, practical guides, and translations are frequently looked upon as the usual contribution from this side of the water. The element of truth in this assertion has neglected, perhaps, the conditions which have faced the growth of the Church in America and the urgency of the necessities which engaged her attention. Nevertheless, American Catholic scholars are beginning to make themselves felt in several fields of intellectual pursuit, and especially in the study of Sacred Scripture.

The work of Dr. Thompson and Mr. Stock should go far in changing the opinion of many in regard to the qualifications and results of American Catholic scholarship. That the English-speaking world has long experienced the need of an adequate concordance of Sacred Scripture is too well known and too keenly felt to need recall. For the first time, we now have a complete Concordance of the entire Bible—a Concordance that not only satisfies the need but does it with eminent dignity and scrupulous scholarship. It would be hard to exaggerate the importance and usefulness of this excellent work. The immensity of patient labor which went into the making of the indispensable volume has placed the English-speaking world, clerical and lay, in the debt of these two scholars and their publisher.

This Concordance is based on the Douay Version and was in process of printing before the New Version was completed. Nevertheless, the value of the Concordance is scarcely lessened since the New Version retains in the main the wording of the Old. For the Old Testament the present Concordance is unsurpassed. Furthermore, the present generation is as yet more familiar with the old version and will consequently find the Concordance of manifold utility. Biblical literature in English has used almost exclusively the Douay Version.

This new Catholic Concordance relieves us of the necessity of depending on non-Catholic works. The careful work of the collaborators compares very favorably with the best foreign concordances. For some few words this Concordance falls somewhat short of the work of Crudens, but in many others it excells it, and as a whole is quite commendable.

The publishers are to be thanked for the real service they have rendered the Catholic cause in launching this splendid example of a permanent contribution of American Catholic scholarship.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A., S.S.L.

JACQUES MARITAIN, *The Living Thoughts of Saint Paul* (New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1941). Pp. 160. $1.25.

This volume is number 20 of "The Living Thoughts Library," edited by Alfred O. Mendel. We wish, first of all, to congratulate the editor and the publishers for having selected Jacques Maritain to present "The Living Thought of Saint Paul." For Maritain is an unqualified believer in the supernatural and in everything that St. Paul believed and taught. He accepts as genuine without qualification all of the fourteen Pauline epistles, and takes at its face value the account of the Apostle's conversion given in the New Testament. None but a believer can, we are convinced, correctly grasp and sympathetically present the sublime thoughts of the great Apostle.

In a beautiful introduction Mr. Maritain presents an appreciation of the Apostle's work, and concludes by stating his purpose. We shall let him speak for himself:

> In the chapters that follow, there will be found grouped together the principal texts wherein are expounded these Pauline themes. There also will be found the texts relating to the more significant of the other elements in Saint Paul's teaching, wherein the natural fire of an inspiration more profound than all the developments that theology can draw therefrom illumines the whole of Christian dogma and Christian morals, and especially Christology.
>
> But Saint Paul's teaching is inseparable from its experience... It is, therefore, supremely important for us to know something about his experience... For this reason it seems well to begin with the succession of events related in the Acts of the Apostles, and with the texts in which Paul himself tells us of his life and his vocation (p. 9).

Cardinal Newman says: "When a saint himself is the speaker, he interprets his own action.... I want to hear a saint converse; I am not content to look at him as a statue; his words are the index of his hidden life." Following this principle Mr. Maritain lets the Apostle speak for himself in lengthy excerpts (with references invariably inindicated), grouped under various headings such as "The Apostolate... The Law of Grace... The Redeemer, etc."

The text used is that of the excellent Westminster Version; occasionally however, the author introduces original translations. The passages quoted are connected by Mr. Maritain's brief comments. They are excellent. For example:

> Justification by faith is inseparable in Paul's thought from the doctrine of incorporation into Christ.
>
> And now all moral precepts of the Law, far from being destroyed, are confirmed, because Faith makes it possible to fulfill them in a lasting and complete fashion, and because from henceforth they represent only that behavior which is fitting to a being already made just and free of sin in his root powers, to the extent that he clings to Christ and receives his life from Him. The meaning of these precepts has been transfigured: they no longer command bad men to be good and to grow into something which they are not; rather do they command good men not to be bad, and not to fail in that which they already are, not to fall back into the state of slavery from whence they have been freed (p. 62).

Mr. Maritain's presentation of Saint Paul's thoughts will surely help the reader to a better understanding and appreciation of the Apostle's message, and we hope sincerely that number 20 of "The Living Thoughts Library" will be widely circulated and thoughtfully read.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

JOHN E. STEINMUELLER., *A Gospel Harmony* (New York: W. H. Sadlier Inc., 1942). Pp. XL, 166 with Index. $2.50.

Fr. Steinmueller has given us an attractive quarto volume featuring the Confraternity Edition of the New Testament. The Gospels are arranged in parallel columns whenever they coincide, and as John is included in this arrangement, we have a harmony and not merely a synopsis.

Luke has been chosen as guide in the chronological arrangement of the text—a wise choice in view of his expressed intention to write an orderly account. In the second column is placed the text of Matthew; in the third, Mark's. This is an interesting arrangement, in view of the fact that Luke always follows Mark's historical order in preference to that of Matthew, whose tendency to group logically related ideas is generally recognized. In adopting his plan the author follows his former professors, Fr. Hetzenauer and Msgr. Ruffini.

Some thirty pages of introduction initiate the reader into the important problems of New Testament study. After his treatment of the Synoptic Problem the author sets forth his conclusions concerning the birth of Christ, the beginning and duration of the public ministry, and the chronology of the passion and death of Jesus.

It is hardly necessary in this review to dwell at length upon the obvious good points of this work, such as the excellent binding, good paper, clear print, and the title headings over each pericope. But without detracting from these good points, we venture to say that what is not so obviously outstanding or successful is the introduction; and this is important, for it is the ideas and conclusions of the introduction which are in back of the decision governing the disposition of the *Harmony*.

In the first place, too much is crowded into too little. I realize, of course, that in matters of this sort it is difficult to strike the happy medium; but it is possible. Here the Synoptic Problem is allotted seven pages, and the day of Christ's death is given three, leaving only a handful of pages for the other problems. This leads to a statement of the questions and of the conclusions, but the discussion is cursory and as a result the introduction is not as helpful to the ordinary reader as it might well be.

The treatment of the Synoptic Problem follows the acceptable indications of similarities and dissimilarities in subject matter, order of facts, and form or style. The hypotheses of Oral Tradition, Mutual Dependence, Written Manuscripts, are each examined, and in conclusion the author indicates his adherence to the Mixed Hypothesis (The Most Probable Theory). Many will doubtless be surprised to find the name of M. J. Lagrange (not J. M. as here) aligned with those who held that "the Logia of Matthew (Q) remains practically the same, i.e. the Hebrew or Aramaic Gospel of St. Matthew which was substantially different from our canonical Greek Gospel of St. Matthew" (p. xv). Fr. Steinmueller had only to consult the introduction of Barton's Harmony (p. xix), or Lagrange's Commentary on Mark (Preface and pp. xxxvi-xxxvii), or the Revue Biblique (1896, p. 27ff; 1912, p. 635f.), or Vosté (p. 45, note 1), or Renié (IV, p. 124, n. 1), to ascertain beyond all possible doubt that such a statement is contrary to fact. In his writings and lectures Lagrange always held for the substantial conformity of our canonical Matthew with the Aramaic Logia of Matthew. The suspicion arose from the fact that he carried the battle to the critics, using their own terminology (such as Q) and even at times arguing out their own points in a *dato non concesso* manner, or merely as "a working hypothesis."[1] Incidentally, the name preceding that of Huby on this page should be Coppieters.

A somewhat disconcerting conclusion may be pointed out in the section (p. xxi) which deals with the duration of the public ministry. Propaganda of all opinions, the one year, two year, and three year ministry, are mentioned by name, and this is followed up by the statement: "It is evident that our Lord celebrated four Passovers, and hence three full years and a few months will be required..." Strange that this *evident* fact failed to impress those who hold for the two year theory, to say nothing of the defenders of the hopeless one year theory.

In the matter of the public ministry we prefer to follow the two years theory based on St. John. Fr. Steinmueller argues that the unusual phrase "second-first Sabbath" (Luke 6,1) is "commonly acknowledged" to have some relation with the Passover. Yet St. Jerome could find no meaning for it, and St. Gregory Nazianzen could not enlighten him on the matter. If it refers to a Jewish manner of reckoning a date, it is curious to find it in St. Luke, who seldom bothers with such details and generally spares his Gentile readers such specifically Jewish matters. Lagrange thinks the phrase was due to a scribal error, and omits it from his text altogether, so that it reads: "It came to pass on a sabbath..." Certainly the phrase is too uncertain to serve as a basis for a theory of four Passovers, even when taken in conjunction with Jn. 4:35, which does not clearly allude to the second of four of them.

---

[1] "J'ai examiné assez longuement la question des rapports possibles entre Marc et l'original sémitique de Matthieu, que j'ai désigné par le sigle Q (source) puisqu'il s'agit d'une discussion très épineuse avec des critiques, et qu'il faut bien qu'on se serve d'une notation connue si l'on veut discuter" (*R.B.* 1912, 635-636).

There next follows a discussion of the age of Christ (p. xii-xxii). We are informed that He began His public ministry in 29 A.D., at the age of thirty-seven (having been born in 8 B.C.); this might conceivably be what St. Luke had in mind when he said (3:23) that Christ was "about thirty" at the time of His baptism. He died at the age of forty-one in 33 A.D. To reach this conclusion, Jn. 8:57 is taken to mean that Christ had "at least entered his fortieth year," and the testimony of Irenaeus is adduced by way of confirmation. Such confidence is undeserved. Irenaeus assures his readers that he depends for his opinion upon some of the elders who had learned it from John and other disciples. Now these elders were surely those of Papias, the source of Irenaeus' information. Papias in turn got his information from recent pilgrims from the Holy Land who, passing through Hierapolis, were never at a loss for an answer—even concerning the age of Christ. Eusebius—and most moderns echo his sentiments—took Irenaeus to task for his uncritical credulity in such matters. It was not necessary that Christ experience all the phases of human existence, but the conviction that He must have done so led Irenaeus to place His death under the Emperor Claudius (41-54), and to affirm in the face of history that Pontius Pilate was still procurator at this time. Not that to reject in this matter the testimony of a great defender of the Faith in any way impugns his authority as a witness of the Eastern and Western Churches.

The author urges the year 33 as the most probable year for the death of Christ. That being the case, we can know with certainty the date of Christ's death once we have established the day of the Pasch that year. For Fr. Steinmueller, Christ, the Pharisees, and the people ate the Passover on Thursday, but the Boethusians and Sadducees ate it on Friday. Thus the Pharisees who had already eaten their Passover lambs and the Sadducees who had not yet eaten theirs, were free to carry out the destruction of Christ. It is not quite clear why this should be called without qualification the "anticipation" theory, but at any rate it is very definitely the system of Strack and Billerbeck, and has rallied to itself many scholars. Instead, however, of doing away completely with the difficulty merely on the basis of doctrinal or rubrical differences, the system gains much by supposing some uncertainty as to the actual date of the new moon, a *dubium facti,* which would be decided for individuals by the leaders of the parties.

To conclude: the format of *A Gospel Harmony* is a credit to the publisher. The introduction presents, gathered together in English almost for the first time, some of the solutions given to New Testament problems. It might have made a much more favorable impression if the arguments it sets forth had been more clearly weighed and thought out, more accurately stated, and more palatably presented.

R. T. MURPHY, O.P.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, *Amos Studies,* Parts, I-III (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1941). Pp. XI, 428.

This is the first volume of a projected commentary on the whole book of Amos. It contains three studies which were first published in the *Hebrew Union College Annual,* 1936-1938, and the reviewer is entirely sympathetic with the "growing demand" which necessitated the reprint of these studies in book form.

Professor Morgenstern advances the thesis that "Amos delivered only one, single address, on the New Year's Day (probably of the year 751), at the northern national sanctuary at Bethel, an address the delivery of which did not require more than a half hour at the very most, one of the most logically and artistically perfect and oratorically effective and inspiring addresses in all literature" (p. vii). This, he assures the reader, "was not at all preconceived, but grew entirely out of the close, analytical study of the Book." That this thesis will be accepted in its entirety in scholarly circles is highly improbable. Nevertheless *Amos Studies* in general will shed considerable new light on the activity and writing of the first of Israel's canonical prophets. The author's enthusiasm for his subject, his broad erudition, and his keen powers of analysis give ample assurance on that score.

Part I (pp. 3-124) studies the biographical sections of the book of Amos. Amos' encounter with Amasias at the Bethel sanctuary is reconstructed thus: 7:10-15; 3:3-6,8 (3:7 is expunged as a gloss); 7:16-17. Quite convincingly Morgenstern solves the problem that has embarrassed exegetes, namely, the relation of 3:3-8 to the rest of the book: they are part of Amos' reply to Amasias and vindicate the prophet's right to speak in Yahweh's name. Next the visions are reconstructed, with considerable textual emendation, in the following order: Locusts, 7:1-3; Consuming Fire, 7:4-6; Fruit, 8:1-2; Plumbline, 7:7-8. 7:7-8 follows 8:1-2 chronologically because it presents the logical climax to the four visions: it shows that Israel's doom is sealed. These four visions are not part of the prophet's address, but the "indispensable preparation for Amos' prophetic career" which "must have preceded his setting out for Bethel" (p. 90). The fifth vision, the Destruction of the Sanctuary, 9:1a*α*, 3:14b, 15ab*α*, 9:1a*β*b, 3:15b*β* preceded his setting out for Bethel" (p. 90). The fifth vision was seen by Amos immediately after the delivery of his address on the New Year'e Day festival of 751: it revealed the earthquake that was to follow in 749, two years later (1:1), and was intended to show the prophet (and through him the people) that the doom of Israel which he predicted was not to be confused with the earthquake which destroyed the Bethel sanctuary. The explanation of the texts given along with their reconstruction is excellent, but it is regrettable that throughout the studies the author indulges too freely in textual criticism and succumbs to the temptation of re-writing difficult texts. Surprising, too, from one so thoroughly acquainted with the literature on the subject is his translation of 7:14: "I am not a prophet ..." (p. 31). Long since Koenig has shown that the past tense, "I *was* not a prophet ... " is the only correct translation. Had Morgenstern noted this fact, he would not be puzzled that Amos calls himself *nabi* in 3:8; 7:16. It is quite true that he distinguishes himself definitely from the professional prophets by his insistence upon a personal divine call. On the other hand, he recognizes a sufficient community of characteristics between himself and them to call himself *nabi.*

Part II (pp. 127-179) attempts to determine the date of Amos' prophecy. Morgenstern re-interprets 4 Kgs. 15:3-5 and 2 Par. 26:16-21 in the light of certain hints from Josephus (*Antiquities,* IX, 10, 4). Thence he concludes that King Ozias was stricken with leprosy apparently as he was officiating in high priestly capacity in the Temple on New Year's Day, the culmination of the Asif festival, which according to the author was superseded by the Day of Atonement only in post-exilic times. The leprosy was first noticed when a stream of light—supposedly the *kabod Yahweh*—entering through a cleft in the Temple, fell upon the face of the king. Now this cleft in the Temple was caused by the earthquake referred to in Zach. 14:4-5, the same as that of Am. 1:1. This leprosy forced Ozias to retire at once. Joatham ascended the throne as regent in place of his father. If 749 is the date of the beginning of Joatham's reign, the same year as that of the earthquake of Am. 1:1, we arrive at the year 751 as the date of Amos' ministry. This second study is definitely less satisfying than the other two in the volume. It depends upon many hypothetical premises, e.g., the validity of Morgenstern's reconstruction and re-interpretation of various texts, his theories on the evolution of Israelite festivals and calendars, and his theory on the evolution of the high-priesthood. The suspicion is aroused, which the author himself foresees, that he is "carried away by an obsession to see New Year's Day rites everywhere, ... " (p. 306). Among other biblical events which took place on this day are Elias' challenge to the Baal prophets, 3 Kgs. 18:25-34 (p. 306); the murder of the Baal worshippers by Jehu, 4 Kgs. 10:1-28 (p. 357); Isaias' call to the prophetic office (p. 393).

Part III (pp. 183-428) traces the historical antecedents of Amos' prophecy. The economic and social factors that explain not only much of the history of the two kingdoms from the time of David but also the profound repercussion in outlook on the part of both professional and personal prophets are deftly exposed. The commercial relations of the Chosen People with the Phoenicians and the Arameans are described with particular clarity. Morgenstern traces the gradual transition from nomadic, pastoral life through the period of agricultural development to a civilization of extended commercial enterprise. This tended to divide Israel into two clearly defined classes, the rich and the poor, with the consequent enslavement of the latter. The pastoral life from which Israel had emerged was always looked upon as the ideal by the prophets. Hence they consistently opposed the commercial ambitions of the successful kings of both Juda and Israel and did not hesitate to plot the downfall of any king who did not fall in line with their program. Here, however, the author generalizes too freely. He sees the influence of the prophets in every overthrow of dynasty: "Such political revolutions and changes of dynasty, we have learned and we shall come to see even more clearly, were the regular program of the professional prophets whenever in their opinion circumstances justified and the opportunity offered" (pp. 258-259). As a result we are assured that Baasa (p. 220) and Omri (p. 221) owed their thrones to prophetic intrigue, and Joas (p. 380) and Amasias (p. 391) were murdered by "adherents of the prophetic party." Again, this reviewer cannot agree that Elias was "unquestionably the very first" (p. 284) and Amos the second of the great individual prophets. While Morgenstern is perfectly correct in insisting upon three classes of prophets—professional, false, and personal—the biblical accounts certainly forbid our excluding great characters like Samuel, Nathan, Micheas, son of Jemla, Jonas, and Eliseus from the ranks of the prophets of supernatural vocation. Finally, in the light of Albright's recent masterful studies on Moses' monotheism, the author will doubtless in his next volume modify his views on the priority of Amos' monotheism, as confidently asserted for example on p. 427: "... Amos was the first ... to conceive of Yahweh as somewhat more than a purely national deity, as a universal god whose authority and purpose reach out over, not Israel alone, but all the nations equally ..." Along with that now outmoded postulate of the evolution of Israel's religion must go many other presuppositions contained in *Amos Studies*.

EDWARD F. SIEGMAN, C.PP.S.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941). Pp. XIII, 917. $4.00.

The reader who accepts Mr. Pfeiffer's authority will rise from this book with three main impressions: first, those who defend the Bible as God's word are talking nonsense; second, the Bible was written in great part by visionaries and deceivers; third, the Bible, though resting on delusion, is still somehow the world's greatest literature.

Now Mr. Pfeiffer, a professed Bible critic, invites his reader, and hence his reviewer, to be critical. But within the limits of a review, how be at once critical and fair?

I will imitate St. Jerome, whom Pfeiffer calls "that prince among Biblical scholars" (p. xi). To test a Bible scholar, says St. Jerome, see if he understands the Chronicler: *omnis eruditio Scripturarum in hoc continetur* (*In Lib. Par.* juxta LXX, MPL 29, 403).

In the 31 pages (782-812) devoted to the Books of Chronicles, Mr. Pfeiffer's first heading is entiled: The Religion of the Chronicler. Under this heading I seek a sentence to characterize Mr. Pfeiffer's mode of procedure. The concluding sentence serves my purpose.

> Thus, with a supercilious contempt for any facts contradicting his dogma (and this also characterizes P and other theologians) the Chronicler glibly asserts that the Law (including P and P^s) goes back to Moses and was observed, with occasional lapses, since his day—although he knew as well as Josiah that "our fathers have not *heard* (so with 2 Kgs. 22:13, LXX, and Syriac) the word of the Lord to do according to all that is written in this book" (2:34:21).

Is the meaning of that sentence clear? It ought to be. The blurb says the book is "distinctly readable." Possibly the blurb-writer includes in readability a liking for parentheses, brackets, dashes, and puzzling quotation marks.

Context may help us. The Chronicler believed 'the book found in the Temple in 621 to be the completed Pentateuch' (p. 791). That is "his dogma." And "the fact which contradicts his dogma" is the text of Kgs. (*ibid.*). And how does the Chronicler show "supercilious contempt" for the fact which contradicts his dogma? He "changes the text of Kings" (*ibid.*).

Prepared by this context, we notice that our sentence (quoted above) has two parts, separated by the dash. The first part repeats the accusation, the second part proves that accusation. The proof runs thus.

1) According to the text in Kings, Josias says that the fathers did not *hear* [i.e. physically] the words of this book.

2) The Chronicler reads that sentence. He knows what it means. It means that the Pentateuch was not promulgated by Moses, otherwise the fathers would have *heard* [i.e. physically] the words of this book. By letting that sentence stand, the Chronicler would wreck his dogma, i.e. Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. What shall he do? The remedy is simple. Copying the sentence, he writes "the fathers did not *observe* (instead of *hear*) the words of this book." That falsifies the statement, because those who do not *observe* are presupposed to have *heard*. But when his dogma is in question, the Chronicler, like other theologians, has a "supercilious contempt for facts."

Thus runs the proof. To test it, just one simple step is necessary: Read 2 Kgs. 22:13. The pertinent part of the verse runs thus: "Our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book to do according unto all that which is written concerning us."

Here we may well rub our eyes. The text speaks of "moral hearing," "obedient hearing." Our fathers, says Josias, did not "hearken unto, so as to do." Physical hearing, far from being denied, is necessarily implied. Context alone would decide the matter. The wrath of the Lord, says Josias, is kindled against us. Why? Because, perhaps, the fathers did not hear physically? Then we have no reason for wrath. But because the fathers, having heard, did not hearken unto, so as to do, therefore "great is the wrath of the Lord, that is kindled against us." This part of the sentence Mr. Pfeiffer omits. But he does retain the words "to do according to all that is written in this book." And these words, by themselves alone, show that the meaning of the sentence in Kings is identical with that of the corresponding sentence in the Chronicler.

If Mr. Pfeiffer still insists, let him show us any version, ancient or modern, wherein the Chronicler contradicts Kings. The LXX, for instance, which he invokes within mysterious brackets, removes even the shadow of a difference by using one and the same word (*ἀκούω*) in each text.

But the Hebrew? Does our author find foothold there? Not if standard lexicographers have the word. They agree with the translators. If you enjoy irony, turn to Robinson-Brown. There, on p. 1034 (*s.v.* שׁמע, l.k.) you will find 2 Kgs. 22:13 listed as first example of the meaning "listen to, 'yield to.' "

Quid ergo? Starting from a non-existent contradiction, Mr. Pfeiffer calls the Chronicler a—what? Well, re-read the sentence. Then glance again at the Bible, and conclude. Someone has a "supercilious contempt for any facts contradicting his dogma." And that someone is not the Chronicler. Someone has "changed the text of Kings." And that someone is not the Chronicler. The Chronicler is but a mirror, reflecting the critic who gazes. The book which results from that kind of gazing may be, as the blurb says, a "monument of Old Testament scholarship." But if so, Old Testament scholarship is more autobiographical than critical.

I regret the severity of this judgment. This book does show immense erudition. It has beautiful pages on the Bible as literature. It can be of great value—but only for the wary and critical reader, who refuses to accept as infallible the author's pontifical pronouncements. The other class of readers, whose name is legion, will carry away the monstrous impressions outlined in the first sentence of this review.

PATRICK CUMMINS, O.S.B.

An Indexed Bibliography of the Writings of William Foxwell Albright; published in honor of his fiftieth birthday by a committee of his former students; prepared for the committee by Harry W. Orlinsky (New Haven, Conn.: The American Schools of Oriental Research, (1941). Pp. XXII, 66.

Dr. Albright is universally known as an indefatigable, judicious, and penetrating scholar of unusual attainments, who has exerted a profound influence on all branches of knowledge pertaining to the ancient Near East. The present volume, therefore, is not only a striking proof of the esteem in which he is held by his former pupils but also an extremely useful aid to scholarly research. It is divided into two parts: a bibliography and an index. The bibliography lists his writings in the chronological sequence of their appearance. The index records in alphabetical order, with appropriate references, the topics discussed in these writings. The world of scholarship owes Harry W. Orlinsky a deep debt of gratitude for this indispensable compilation.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

ELEANOR ANTHONY KING, *Bible Plants for American Gardens* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941). xiv, 203.

The biblical student who wishes to combine his fondness for gardening with his devotion to the Bible will welcome this book with delight. He will learn which plants he must grow indoors and whch he can hope to cultivate outdoors in gardens under the conditions of our American climate. There are, also, excellent suggestions for using the Bible plants for decorative and other purposes in the home, at church bazaars and suppers.

Let not the learned professor who is averse or indifferent to gardening imagine that this book contains nothing of interest to himself. Every teacher of the Bible needs some work of reference on the plants of Palestine. First of all, they played an important part in the social religious, and economic life of the Chosen People; secondly, the imagery of the Bible is not infrequently derived from the vegetation of its native soil. The present book, so eminently readable, will solve the average difficulties of the scriptural student in this regard.

The author is a competent botanist, who has taken great pains to be accurate and reliable. She describes each plant mentioned in the Bible under the name which it bears in the Authorized Version, but does not hesitate to correct the mistranslations of this version. Her language is clear, popular, and suffused with a warm sympathy for her subject. There are some excellent photographs of biblical plants; the reader will regret that these are not more numerous. Hebrew and Greek terms are unfortunately lacking, but this was to be expected in a book intended for the general public.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

The New Testament in Basic English (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1941).

Already this book has gone through ten printings and it will surely be printed over and over again as soon as it becomes known by scholars and readers through the country and throughout the world.

The work was done by a committee under the direction of Mr. S. H. Hooks, Professor of Old Testament Studies in the University of London. The Committee worked together with the Orthological Institute. A magnificent result has crowned their labors. They have produced an English translation of the New Testament based on the original Greek which ranks with the very best.

The book is written in what is called Basic English. It is a simple form of the English language consisting of about one thousand words which is able to give the sense of anything which may be said in English. And the work is done well. Probably its outstanding characteristics are an extreme straightforwardness and a magnificent simplicity.

In striving after simplicity which indeed was necessary because of the relative poverty of vocabulary, the authors have succeeded remarkably well in reproducing the grand and noble simplicity of the original New Testament which is its rare unique characteristic. In spite of the necessary candor and simplicity of the language of this New Testament in Basic English, it is in general a true and exact rendering of the meaning of the original.

It is not only, then, a work of independent literary value but it may be considered along with other English translations of the New Testament as an attempt, and a very good one at that, to give the true and whole meaning of the Greek New Testament. It has value as a translation. In some places, just because of its simplicity, it is a real improvement on the current King James version and in general it always gives an intelligent rendering of the meaning of the original authors.

In some few places an inexact translation has been given where simplicity could have been preserved or even improved upon, without any sacrifice as to the true meaning. The translation of St. Matthew (1:23), quoting Isaias (7:14), is an example: "See, the unmarried woman will be with child, and will give birth to a son. And they will give him the name Immanuel."

EDWARD A. MANGAN C.SS.R.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Some of these may be reviewed in subsequent issues)

B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.:

The Earliest Christian Liturgy. By Rev. Josef Maria Nielen. Translated by Rev. Patrick Cummins, O.S.B. 1941. Pp. x, 416. $3.00.

Behrman's Jewish Book House, New York, N.Y.:

The Sabbath Book. By Samuel M. Segel. 1942. Pp. xv. 238. $3.00.

Catholic Book Publishing Co., New York, N.Y.:

I Pray the Mass. Sunday Missal for all Sundays and Principal Feast days with a Treasury of Private Prayers. Arranged by Rev. Hugo H. Hoever, S.O.Cist. Ph.D. 1942. Pp. 447. Price $.35 to 3.50.

THE MORAL CAUSES OF THE FLOOD

I. MORAL CORRUPTION CAUSED BY MIXED AND PURELY SENSUAL MARRIAGES BETWEEN SETHITES AND CAINITES

"And after that men began to be multiplied upon the earth, and daughters were born to them, the sons of God seeing the daughters of men, that they were fair, took to themselves wives of all which they chose" (Gen. 6:1-2).

What "men" had begun "to be multiplied upon the earth"? Some think that only descendants of Cain and Seth are intended, since in the preceding chapters only the posterity of these two sons of Adam is mentioned. Others would confine the term to the men known to Noe and his family, on the ground that the patriarch, who is the author of the diluvian tradition, could not be concerned with people wholly unknown to him. But the great majority of commentators hold that the subject of the passage is the whole human race, since the Vulgate's word for "men" translates the Hebrew *hā'ādām,* a collective noun used to designate "humanity," "the human race." Thus, "let us make man (*'ādām*) to our image and likeness" (Gen. 1:26) is the divine decree preceding the creation of Adam. This last opinion is preferable to the other two.

"And daughters were born to them." Why does the author say nothing of sons? Doubtless in view of the misfortune he is about to record, that woman through her physical attractions was to become the chief moral cause of the flood, and so to bring humanity a second time to devastation.

It would be nothing less than ridiculous to infer that the inspired writer's reason for mentioning only daughters was because the descendants of Cain, owing to their depravity, could beget only feeble and chiefly female offspring. No such law of heredity attends the corruptions of the modern world. The supposition would also make it difficult to explain a common susceptibility of Sethites to Cainite allurements, for what seductive power could degenerate women exert over robust and virile men? On the contrary, the inspired text rather emphasizes the extraordinary beauty of "the daughters of men" as attractive to "the sons of God."

A very few authors maintain that the remark "and daughters were born to them" is a glossary note. They consider the grammatical construction anomalous in Hebrew, as the plural pronoun *lāhem* has for antecedent the singular *hā'ādām.* They further argue that the clause adds nothing of significance to the narrative, and that its explanatory character reflects a later origin. These last two arguments are so patently weak that only the first deserves attention. As to this, the collective singular *hā'ādām,* being equivalently plural, presents no difficulty as antecedent to *lāhem.*

"The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men, that they were fair," etc. Who are the two classes thus designated? The treatment of this question at considerable length is indispensable to a knowledge of the true causes of the universal degeneracy punished by the flood, as well as to the problem of the anthropological extent of the catastrophe itself.

In the phrase "sons of God" the name in the original is *'Elohim.* This in Hebrew literature primarily designates Yahweh, the one God and the true, before whom all other gods are nothing (Deut. 32:15; Ps. 50:22; Hab. 3:3). But *'Elohim* as a natural plural is also applied to false gods (Gen. 31:30,32; Ex. 18:11; Deut. 10:7), and to the judges of Israel (Ps. 81:6), as well as to princes and kings (Ex. 21:6). On the other hand, the word "sons" (*b^{e}nêy*) may be taken (1) in its strict meaning of natural sonship, or (2) in a wider and derived use denoting a moral or spiritual relation. Thus Seth is the son of Adam by nature, and Israel, the son of God by moral adoption or spiritual sonship. Hence it follows that etymologically the expression *b^{e}nêy hā'elōhîm* may have four meanings: sons of the true God, sons of the false gods, sons of the judges, sons of the princes (nobles or kings).

Some earlier Jewish writers insisted upon the last interpretation, seeing in "the sons of God" the sons of nobles or kings. Symmachus, Aquila, and the Targums make the phrase denote the offspring of rich and powerful men. As opposed to these, "the daughters of men" would have been women of humble extraction. Universal corruption would then have resulted from marriages, contracted from purely sensual motives, between partners of unequal conditions, the commoners debasing the children of noble families to their own baser and viler level. Nothing in the sacred text justifies this explanation, and it is now so generally discarded that its refutation would be superfluous.

The second and third interpretations of "sons of God" are likewise untenable here. The account betrays no allusion to false gods or idolatry. No "judges" appear until long after this period. The only explanation which remains possible is that the "sons of God" are sons of Yahweh in a moral relation. They are human beings characterized by a common piety and devotion to the true God, and by a mission from Him which could justify this peculiar title.

This conclusion raises the further question of their identity. Some would consider them suprahuman beings, or angels. Others see in them the descendants of Seth in general. Still others, including many modern authors, think them a special group of the Sethites chosen by God as custodians of His revealed word. Hence, the "daughters of men" by contrast would be, in the first opinion, all women in general; in the second, female descendants of Cain; in the third, those women of Sethite origin who had no part in the covenant relation. Consequently, in the first hypothesis, the general corruption which occasioned the flood was due to unions between attractive women in general and evil angels. In the second, it would be due to marriage between Sethite men and Cainite women. In the third supposition, it would have resulted from marriages between Sethites of dissimilar mission or virtue. These three interpretations must now be examined more thoroughly.

A few of the Fathers held that "the daughters of men" were women in general and that "the sons of God" were fallen angels. This seemed to them to explain angelic and human apostasy together. The perverted angels, originally commissioned by God to control the forces of nature, were supposed to have fallen in love with women and engendered the giants famous from ancient times, so that both angels and women were plunged into hell.[1]

Strange as this theory seems today, it was not without ostensible support. In the best Mss. of the Septuagint the reading for "sons of God" is "angels of God."[2] This would suggest by contrast that "the daughters of men" were simply women in general.

---

[1] Justin, *Apol.* II, v, MPG 6, 452; Athenagoras, *Leg. pro Chr.* xxiv, MPG 6, 948; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* III, vii, MPG 8, 1161; *Paedagogus* III, ii, MPG 8, 575; Tert. *de Idololatria* ix, MPL 1, 747; *de cultu faem.* I, ii, MPL 1, 1419; Irenaeus *adv. Haer.* IV, xvi, 2, MPG 7, 1016; Cyprian *de sing. cleric.*, MPL 4, 935; *de habitu Virg.* xiv, MPL 4, 466-7; Ambrose, *de Noe et Arca* IV, viii, MPL 14, 385.

[2] Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, I, 9.

Carnal union between depraved spirits and human beings might have been further suggested by the influence of Jewish thought at the time, as revealed by the apocryphal literature both before and after Christ.

Thus, in the *Book of Jubilees,* it is said that in the time of the Patriarch Jared angels had descended to earth to instruct men in truth and justice. But many of them, seduced by the beauty of the daughters of men, took them to wife, begot the famous giants, and so occasioned a state of corruption which the flood was sent to wash away.

In the same period the *Book of Henoch* also ascribes the universal corruption of men and the divine retribution to sensually prompted unions between angels and women.

> When the sons of men had become multiplied, in those days it came about that gracious and beautiful daughters were born to them. And the angels, the sons of heaven, saw them, and desired them, and said one to another, "Come, let us choose women from among mankind and beget us children,"... And they took women for themselves; all of them chose women, and began to cohabit and to commit fornication with them.... These [women] having conceived brought forth mighty giants whose height was 3,000 cubits... Then the Most High, the All-Holy spoke concerning this matter; sending an angel to the son of Lamech [Noe], He spoke, and said, "Say to him in my Name, 'Hide thyself,'" and reveal to him the coming end; tell him that all the earth is lost, that there will come a flood upon all the earth, which will destroy all that is there.[3]

The *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,* probably written during the first century B.C., is the story of the twelve sons of Jacob. Here the giants are not the direct fruit of union between angels and the daughters of men. The latter, while conceiving of their legitimate husbands, saw the marvelous angels, who appeared as tall as the heavens, and mutual longing ensued, whereupon the women begot sons of great stature, who filled the earth with sin and corruption.

Philo of Alexandria, a witness to the traditions of Egyptian Judaism in the first Christian century, and Flavius Josephus, another Jewish writer of the same age and fully conversant with the contemporary thought of Palestine, both accepted the hypothesis that "the sons of God" were fallen angels, and "the daughters of men," the women of earth.

---

[3] Ch. Robert, "Les fils de Dieu et les filles des hommes," *Revue Biblique,* 1895, pp. 368-9.

Jewish and Christian writers alike knew of Old Testament passages which favored this explanation of "sons of God." Three times in Job (1:6; 2:1; 38:7) and once in the Psalms (89:7) the expression clearly designates "angelic beings." Moreover, the context of Gen. 6 would seem to imply the same meaning there. It has already been pointed out that "the daughters of men" must be females of the human race at large. By contrast, therefore, "the sons of God" would appear to be creatures of a superior nature—in a word, angelic beings.

But final analysis disposes of all these arguments for the opinion in question. A purely spiritual being, to begin with, cannot be conceived of as sensual and incontinent, or capable of material procreation. Secondly, the fall of the angels is attributed by sound theology to the sin of pride, in common with the fall of Adam.[4] Thirdly, a history of angels plays no part in the aim of Genesis, whose purpose is to record the dealings of God with man as immediate, thus affording no occasion for a possible cultus of superhuman creatures, especially on the part of readers already too susceptible to idolatry. Fourthly, if the angels on this occasion played a leading part in man's corruption, they should bear their part in the sentence of condemnation. Still further, if "the sons of God" are angels, are they good or evil ones? Good angels by such an agency would fall from grace, and such a fall would call for more explicit comment on the part of the Scripture; while angels originally evil could not be called "sons of God." Fifthly, the Hebrew expression "took to themselves wives" is inappropriate to transient intercourse, and indicative of a stable union with women, into which angels could not be supposed to enter. Sixthly, the revelation of Christ, that after the Resurrection men will no longer marry because "they will be like the angels," makes absurd a state of history in which angels might aspire to become like men. Finally, the designation of angels as "sons of God" in four poetical passages in Job and the Psalms affords no criterion for the meaning of the same expression in the purely historical context of Genesis.[5]

---

[4] St. Thomas, *Summa Th.*, I, lxiii, a. 2, c.

[5] For clear definition of the strictly immaterial nature of angels see the Fourth Council of the Lateran, Denz.-Banw. *Ench.* 428. The Vatican Council reiterates this definition: *ibid.* 1783. Since at least the first of these definitions, no Christian could attribute to angels either bodies or carnal passions. That evil spirits could lead human beings into sins of the flesh is not due to their own inclination to such actions, but to their knowledge that

On these grounds, and others which cannot be mentioned here,[6] we must reject any interpretation which would make the Deluge the consequence of a state of society resulting from the union of angelic beings with females of the human race.

Another opinion which has won noteworthy adherents identifies the "sons of God" and the "daughters of men" with male and female descendants of Seth. It supposes our passage to neglect the Cainite race and confine itself to that of Seth, which inherits the divine promises as its peculiar trust. The Sethites are assumed to have peopled their own portion of the primitive world; but it is further assumed that only a part of their race had the divine mission of conserving original revelation. These chosen families would have been "the sons of God," and other Sethites merely "sons of men." The latter, suffering a moral deterioration in the course of time, would eventually degrade also "the sons of God" through matrimonial union. The posterity of Seth thus becoming apostate, only Noe and his sons would have been preserved from the fate deserved by the general corruption.[7]

However, we cannot accept this explanation, not because it conflicts with an anthropological universality of the Flood, but because it seems opposed to the context, to parallel passages, and to the general spirit of Catholic exegesis.

The Context. Leading directly to the announcement of the Flood and of its reasons in Gen. 6 are the list of Cain's posterity in Gen. 4 and that of Seth in Gen. 5. The two clans are in evident moral contrast. Material progress and violence mark the

---

by such means men may be induced to violate the divine law and thus become objects of aversion to their Creator.

[6] Keil believes that the identification of "the sons of God" with angels originated in a mingling of Hellenism with Jewish Cabalism. The Jews of Alexandria were strongly inclined to reconcile the Old Testament with traditional Greek thought. Since "sons of God" are clearly angelic beings in the four poetical passages already referred to, the influence of this idea may account for the reading "angels of God" in some MSS. of the LXX of Gen. 6:2. This would reflect some measure of analogy to "the sons of the gods" familiar to pagan mythology. The reading "sons of God" for "angels of God" is supported by both Tischendorf and Codex Alexandrinus, as well as by the Hebrew and the Vulgate. But some of the Greek Fathers, misled by the latter reading, and not yet clear in their doctrine of the angelic nature, would think themselves committed to a defense of the interpretation rejected here.

[7] Cf. Motais, *Le Déluge biblique,* Paris, 1885, pp. 280-301.

career of Cain's posterity, while the notable achievement in the line of Seth is the sanctity of Henoch. With this introduction nothing could be more natural than that 6:2 should simply allude to the latter group as "sons of God" and to the former as merely "sons of men." In the event of general intermarriage between the two, the defection of the Sethites from their faith and virtue would be as inevitable as in the average "mixed marriage" of today, and could only end in the common apostasy of both races together. It is hard to see how an unbiased reading of the whole account can either overlook so natural an interpretation or insist upon some other and less obvious meaning.

The motive assigned to the marriage confirms this view by one particular link with the preceding context. Moses relates that the sons of God freely intermarried with the daughters of men because "they were fair." The Cainite genealogy in Gen. 4 names three women (a rare practice with Jewish historians), with no apparent reason except their physical attractions. Ada and Sella, the wives of Lamech, and Noema, his daughter,[8] reveal this quality in the etymology of their names. *Ada* means "elegant," "adorned," or "ornament";[9] *Sella* suggests "shade" (*umbra*);[10] *Noema* is "gracious," "lovely," "agreeable" (*gratiosa*).[11] The three women, all of Cainite stock, thus appear in the history as worthy of mention for the one quality, and that alone, which distinguishes "the daughters of men" in 6:2 and is to prove a snare and an occasion of disaster to mankind at large. The conclusion is obvious that "the daughters of men" are none other than daughters of Cain.[12]

The Parallel Passages are not less convincing. It has been noted that outside the present passage the phrase "sons of God" occurs only four times in the Old Testament. The meaning "angels," conceded to these four poetic passages, is to be rejected in Gen. 6:2, as the usage of the Old Testament abundantly shows. Of its historical books only Genesis employs the formula, and only here; but, the same is expressed in other words on many occasions, and is a constant attribute of the Chosen People.

---

[8] Gen. 4:19-24.

[9] Brown-River-Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, Oxford, 1907, on *'adah.*

[10] *Ibid.*, on the verb *sālal* and its derivatives.

[11] *Ibid.*, on the verb *nā'am* and its derivatives.

[12] Cf. Ceuppens, *De Historia Primaeva*, Rome, 1934, pp. 265-6.

Thus: "Israel is my son, my firstborn" (Ex. 4:22). "I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn" (Jer. 31:9). "If I said, I will speak thus, behold, I should condemn the generation of thy children" (Ps. 72:15). "Perfect the same which thy right hand hath planted, and upon the son of man whom thou hast confirmed for thyself" (Ps. 79:16). The prophets so often appeal to this fundamental truth as manifested in Hebrew history that it may suffice merely to indicate Os. 11:1; Isa. 1:2; 30:1,9; 43:6; Jer. 3:14,19; 31:20. In all of these passages the attribute, however expressed, is clearly equivalent to "holy sons," "blessed sons," "sons of God." Since this interpretation is not contested, it cannot be denied that the contrasted formulas "sons of men" or "daughters of men" can and should mean "non-privileged sons" or "daughters of a race not chosen" but merely human.

But mere deduction yields to clear affirmation in Wis. 10:1-4:

> She preserved him [Adam], that was first formed by God, the father of the world, when he was created alone, and she brought him out of his sin and gave him power to govern all things. But when the unjust [Cain] went away from her in his anger, he perished by the fury wherewith he murdered his brother [Abel]. For whose cause [evidently Cain's], when water [the Flood] destroyed the earth, wisdom healed it again, directing the course of the just [Noe] by contemptible wood [the ark].

Since this makes Cain's depravity the cause of the Flood, and this can only have operated through the medium of his posterity, "the daughters of men" are understood by the inspired writer of Wisdom to have been daughters of Cain. What conclusion remains possible except that their opposites, "the sons of God," were descendants of the race of Seth?

The Testimony of the Church. The attitude of Catholic exegesis is quite decisive. We have already mentioned those Fathers of the Church who defended the notion of union between angels and women. Against these a fair majority of Fathers, representing both East and West, and almost all subsequent theologians understand human beings only to have been involved, and more particularly the two primitive families of Cain and Seth. St. Jerome stresses the ambiguity of the expression "sons of God" in Old Testament usage.[13] St. John Chrysostom rejects the intervention of angels.[14] St. Augustine, while troubled by the gravity

[13] Jerome, *Quaest. Hebr. in Gen.*, MPL 23, 996-7.

[14] Chrysostom, *Hom. 22 in Gen.*, MPG 53, 187-190.

of the problem, agrees with the Byzantine bishop.[15] St. Cyril of Alexandria openly denies the agency of angels and identifies "the sons of God" with descendants of Seth and "the daughters of men" with those of Cain.[16] Theodoret upholds the same explanation.[17] St. Thomas reviews the controversy and decides it by expounding the traditional interpretation of his time.[18] Catholic exegetes today are quite unanimous in defence of the opinion upheld in these pages.

"They [the Sethites] took to themselves wives of all [the Cainites] which they chose." Mere sensuality dictated these unions, which may justly be called mixed marriages between the two separate races. And as the Sethites, discarding all restraint, took to wife as many Cainites as they pleased, a shameful state of polygamy ensued with all its attendant degeneracy. The homes of "the sons of God," children of the Messianic race, formerly a stronghold of piety and truth, were now debased to the depths of bestiality. "All the thought of their heart was bent upon evil at all times" (Gen. 6:5). "And when God had seen that the earth was corrupted (for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth), . . . he said: I will destroy man, whom I have made, from the face of the earth, . . . for it repenteth me that I have made them" (Gen. 6:7,12).

Moral corruption, therefore, caused by mixed and purely sensual marriages between Sethites and Cainites, and menacing the very existence of divine revelation, is to be held responsible for the terrible destruction wrought by the Deluge.

II. VIOLENCE AND INJUSTICE OF THE GIANTS

"Now giants were upon the earth in those days. For after the sons of God went in to the daughters of men, and they brought forth children, these are the mighty men of old, men of renown" (Gen. 6:4). "And the earth . . . was filled with iniquity [violence]" (Gen. 6:11).

In these three sentences Holy Writ reveals three important facts: the existence of the giants, their origin before and through the marriages of Sethites with Cainites, and their unenviable part in primitive history and in the occasion of the Flood.

---

[15] Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, MPL 41, 468-471; *Quaest. 3 in Gen.*, MPL 34, 549.

[16] Cyril. Alex., *Glaphyr. in Gen.*, MPG 69, 54-5; *Contra Julianum*, MPG 76, 953.

[17] Theodoret, *Quaest. in Gen.*, MPG 80, 148.

[18] *Summa Theol.* I, li, 3 ad 6.

Much has been said and written about these famous giants. The Hebrew text calls them *n^ephilîm,* a word of uncertain etymology and meaning. According to Lagrange it means "destroyers," as derived from an Assyrian root *nabalu* or *napalu,* "to destroy."[19] Sales believes that its root many equally well be *phālal,* meaning "to be tall."[20] Normally the word expects some such derivation, and St. Jerome seems to justify it by rendering the word *gigantes.* But philologists translate the Hebrew *phālal* "to judge," "to intercede," "to pray," not "to dominate by stature."[21] Most authors favor derivation from *nāphal,* "to fall," "to fall upon," "to invade," so that the *n^ephilîm* would be "attackers," "oppressors."[22]

But whatever the etymology, we must agree with St. Jerome in the meaning "giants." In Num. 13:34, the only other passage where the word occurs, Josue's scouts report: We saw certain *monsters* of the sons of Enac, of the giant kind: in comparison of whom, we seemed like locusts." Since the "monsters" thus described are again *n^ephilîm,* the word must have a similar force in Genesis. This is confirmed by Wis. 14:6; Ecclus. 17:8; Bar. 3:26,28, in none of which, however, have we a Hebrew original, but which apply the term "giants" to the prediluvian type in question here.

This favorite equivalent of St. Jerome's seems to agree with the etymology noted above as preferable. The *n^ephilîm* became destroyers and oppressors because their exceptional stature and strength enabled them to tyrannize over other men, and therefore inclined them to do so. "De tout temps les petits ont souffert de la sottise des grands!" Cruel because proud, proud because powerful, powerful because giants,—the connection is too natural not to be objective and true.

Whence came these extraordinary mortals? From the Vulgate's reading, followed by our version as above, they would seem to have been only the fruit of union between the Sethite and Cainite races. On the other hand, the Hebrew text at first sight suggests that the giants antedated these marriages. Three translations, however, are possible: (1) "There were giants upon the earth in those days and also [especially] after the sons of God were united to the daughters of men." According to this rendering, the giants existed before these marriages, but were increased by means of them. (2) "There were giants on the earth after the sons of God were united to the daughters of men, and even after." This second translation makes no reference to the existence of giants before the mixed marriages; it supposes them the fruit of these marriages, and existing not only thereafter, but even to a time not far remote from that of Moses. (3) "There were giants upon the earth in those days [before the marriages mentioned above], and there were some also after the sons of God were united to the daughters of men." In this third rendition the author does not say that the giants were produced by the marriages in question, but simply that they existed both before and after them.[23]

---

[19] M.-J.Lagrange, O.P., *La Genèse,* p. 152.

[20] M. Sales, O.P., *La Sacra Bibbia,* I, p. 94.

[21] Brown-Driver-Briggs, *ou. cit.,* p. 813.

[22] This etymology, which has considerable weight of authority, is indicated by Greek versions, particularly those of Aquila and Symmachus.

Commentators reconcile these differences by concluding that the giants existed before the Sethite-Cainite unions, but that their number was augmented in the fruit of these unnatural unions. Unless the number and influence of the giants had in fact been thus increased, the close connection of the two themes is hard to explain.

Hence among the moral causes of the Flood must be included the violence and iniquities of the giants. This seems to be indicated by the words: "The earth was corrupted before God, and was filled with iniquity" (Gen. 6:11), where the Hebrew word for "iniquity" is more exactly "violence." Corruption and violence are therefore affirmed to have been the reasons why God visited the human race with the destroying Flood. Since cruelty and impurity are closely related, this is not surprising. It is not rash to hold that these giants, given to violence and oppression, had played a leading rôle in the moral depravity which afflicted mankind. Certainly the inspired writer has cogent reason for giving prominence to the giants as a factor in the conditions leading to the Deluge.

DONAT POULET, O.M.I., PH.L., S.T.D., S.S.L.

University Seminary
Ottawa, Canada

---

[23] Cf. Ceuppens, *De Historia Primaeva*, pp. 238-240.

"TU ES PETRUS"

In the historical records of early Christianity, viz. the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, two Pauline epistles (1 Cor. and Gal.), and the two epistles of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles bears several names. Evidently the same person is now called Simon or Symeon, now Peter, now Simon Peter, now Kephás. The current explanation is that a) the Apostle's original name was Simon or rather Symeon, but that b) our Lord bestowed on him a new name, Kephá in Aramaic, Kephás in its Greek dress, which was later c) changed into its Greek equivalent, Petros. The transition from Petros to Latin "Petrus" scarcely calls for comment. And so we read in Mt. 16:18 "Tu es Petrus."

The explanation is substantially correct. Still, if we examine the documents and the process of change more in detail, it may appear as an oversimplification.

Let us begin by scrutinizing the text chosen for the title of this paper, and let us ask: What exactly did our Lord say and mean by the words which in Latin read: Tu es Petrus?

1. Scholars are agreed today that Christ, when promising the primacy to Peter at Caesarea Philippi, said to him in Aramaic, their common mother tongue: "Thou art kephá, and upon this kephá I will build my Church." That is to say, He used the same word "kephá" twice. Theologians are not averse to this opinion, as witness Wilmers: "Christus, aramaice loquens, bis eadem voce usus esse censendus est."[1]

There was then exact *identity of words.* But one may ask, and scholars have asked themselves: Was there also exact *identity of meaning?* To be more precise: Was the first kephá meant by Christ as a proper name (like John or James) or as a common noun? If it was taken as a proper name, then, though the words were the same, the meaning was not the same; there was what we should call a play on words. If on the other hand the first kephá was intended as a common noun, then there was no play on words, but perfect identity of meaning, though, of course, kephá was both times taken metaphorically. Then Father Knabenbauer's interpretation conveys the exact sense of the passage: "Tu es saxum et super hoc saxum, etc."[2]

---

[1] *De Ecclesia Christi,* p. 149.

[2] *Commentarius in Ev. sec. Matthaeum,* II, p. 54.

We may put the question in another way and thus bring it closer home. Should this text be rendered in English: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock, etc.", or "Thou art a rock, and upon this rock, etc."? All the English translations to which I had access, our new version included, choose the first alternative; James Moffat[3] makes it most emphatic: "Now I tell you, Peter is your name, and on this rock I will build my church." The only exception I know of is Father Spencer. He translates: "Thou art a rock, and upon this rock, etc."; but he gives the alternative rendering in a footnote.

One might think that the French are more fortunate and easily avoid the dilemma by translating: "Tu es Pierre, et sur cette pierre je bâtirai mon église." Cornelius a Lapide thinks that if our Lord had spoken French, He would have put it just so. Van Steenkiste,[4] too, thinks that the French translation avoids all difficulty. But if we look a little closer, we shall see that, in spite of the *identity of sound,* this translation corresponds to the first alternative in English. If the second alternative were adopted with Father Spencer, not only should the capital P be changed, but the translation would have to read: "Tu est une pierre," or "tu es la pierre."

Is there any modern language in which the translator need not choose, but can leave the words as ambiguous as they may have been originally? I do not know. But there is no denying that the commonly received English translation involves a distinct loss; gone is the original identity of words; gone is even the *similarity* of words which we find in Latin and Greek, a loss for which some have thought to compensate by translating: "Thou art Peter, the rock, and upon this rock etc."

2. But since our ordinary translation seems to rest on the supposition that the first kephá was meant by Christ as a proper name or as a permanent surname, one may ask: Do the historical data of the New Testament or Tradition oblige us to make that supposition? Or can one say that the first kephá was meant as a common noun (metaphorically, of course), not as a proper name? To make the question more pointed: Did Peter, at the time when his Master spoke those words to him, already bear the name of Kephá? Or if not, did our Lord mean, then and there, to be-

[3] *A New Translation.*

[4] *Sanctum Iesu Christi Evangelium sec. Matthaeum,* I, p. 628.

stow a new name on him, so that the meaning was (to paraphrase Moffatt's translation): "Peter shall be henceforth your name"?

Now a *change of name* is intimated by all four evangelists. Matthew and John speak rather indefinitely. Matthew (4:18 and 10:2) merely says: "Simon, who is called Peter." He does not say by whom or why or when; if Simon was known by the name of Peter when Matthew wrote his Gospel, or perhaps when the Gospel was translated into Greek, the statement would be true. John (1:42) quotes Jesus as saying: "Thou wilt be called Kephás or Petros." Although St. Augustine,[5] Lagrange[6] etc. gather from this passage that the Master changed Peter's name at their first meeting, actually John's text is as vague as Matthew's; Knabenbauer rightly points to the future tense (vocaberis κληθήσῃ); so does Fillion.[7] Luke 6:14 is a little more definite "Simon, whom He called Peter." Still, does that mean just once, though perhaps so that the name stuck? The statement need not imply more.

Only Mark (3:16) seems to say definitely that Jesus imposed the new name on the occasion of the special calling of the Twelve: "Simon, to whom He gave the name of Petros." Zorell (*s.v.* πέτρα) takes the passage to mean just that. So does van Steenkiste (*l.c.*, I, p. 239). But first of all, the Greek text here is somewhat doubtful, and the grammatical construction is anything but clear.[8] Secondly, Catholic commentators are as a rule more reserved. Maldonatus, who adopts the interpretation given above, calls it "probabilior." Knabenbauer,[9] who calls it "valde probabilis," allows another in the next paragraph. Holzmeister,[10] who also accepts it, yet continues: "Ignoramus vero utrum haec impositio nominis in ipsa hac Apostolorum electione an alia occasione acciderit." Lagrange (*l.c.*) says concerning the change of name: "Les textus permettent seulement de dire que chaque évangéliste l'a mentionné dans la circonstance qui lui paraissait le mieux l'amener."

3. Catholic exegetes then do not insist that Peter bore the name or surname before his confession at *Caesarea Philippi*. Did

---

[5] *De consensu evang.* 2,17,34.

[6] *Evangile selon Saint Jean* (ed. 5, 1936), p. 48.

[7] *The Life of Christ*, II, p. 78.

[8] Lagrange, *Ev. selon Saint Marc*, (ed. 5, 1929), p. 64-5.

[9] *Commentarius in Ev. sec. Marcum*, p. 100.

[10] *Vita S. Petri*, p. 15.

he then receive it on that occasion, as Knabenbauer says,[11] and as Moffatt puts it so emphatically in his translation?

Yes and no. For one may ask: In what exactly did this bestowal of a new name consist? Did it mean that henceforth Kephá should take the place of Simon (as when Yahweh changed Abram's name to Abraham)? Or did it mean at least that Kephá was to be henceforth Simon's constant surname, as we read "Simon Peter" in many passages of the Gospels?

Now if we study the *variations of Peter's name* in our historical records, we can see several reasons why we need not put either construction on "Tu es Petrus." In fact, it is these apparently strange variations that have given rise to the problem here discussed. The salient facts are four in number.

a. First of all, *Jesus Himself* continued to address His Apostle as "Simon" after the calling of the Twelve, after Caesarea Philippi, even after the resurrection.[12] Lagrange says emphatically: "Jésus n'interpelle jamais l'apôtre sous son nom grec *Petros,* ni sous celui de Képhas."[13] As we shall see presently, the statement is not quite accurate, but it is substantially true. But if we suppose that Jesus meant Kephá (on whatever occasion he conferred that name) to be used as a substitute for Simon or as a permanent surname, does not this practice of His sound strange?

The only exception to this practice is Lk. 22:34, where Jesus says to Peter: "I tell thee, Peter, a cock will not crow this day, until thou hast thrice denied that thou knowest me." But first of all, He had already addressed him as Simon (Lk. 22:21), and secondly the context seems to indicate that the name Peter was here meant *ironically,* the Apostle thinking himself firm as a rock in his attachment to the Master, whereas that same night would disclose his weakness.[14]

That the continued use of "Simon" on the part of our Lord is not the work of the redactor, but a case of accurate reporting, is apparent from another observation. Matthew, who himself never refers to the Apostle except as "Peter" or "Simon Peter," twice quotes Jesus as addressing him with "Simon" (16:17; 17:25). Why did Matthew depart from his adopted policy except that our Lord did use that name on both occasions? We may well imagine that the actual words were still ringing in his ears after twenty years or more.

---

[11] *Comment. in Ev. sec. Matthaeum* (ed. 3, 1922), p. 54-5.

[12] Cf. Mk. 14:37; Lk. 22:31; Jn. 21:15-17.

[13] *Ev. selon saint Matthieu* (ed. 4, 1927), p. 342.

[14] The reasons which Lagrange (*Ev. selon saint Luc,* p. 552, 555) advances why Jesus on this occasion used first "Simon" and then "Peter," sound unconvincing. So does his reason why He used "Simon" in Mt. 17:25. Cf. also Father Pickar's essay in this review (1942 p. 134-5).

If, on the other hand, we read in Mk. 16:7 that the angels commission the women at the tomb to "tell His disciples and Peter" (not "Simon"), this may be due to Mark himself, who always calls the Apostle "Peter" after chapter 3, as we shall see.

b. Another strange phenomenon. Also the *Apostles* and *disciples* use the name "Simon" after the resurrection (Lk. 24:34). So does James in the council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:14), though the Greek text there has "Symeon." Jacquier is of the opinion that the name there is due to Luke. I should rather say again that it is a case of *historical accuracy.* Now when one reflects on the reverence with which Apostles and disciples cherished the Master's commands, is it not strange that they should have continued to use the old name when He had substituted another? There is some unexplained discrepancy if we suppose that He once said, explicitly and clearly, in the circle of His Faithful: "Henceforth Kephá is to be your name."

c. There is a third class of facts which bear on our question. Whereas Matthew and John refer to the Apostle throughout their gospels as "Peter" or "Simon Peter," Mark and Luke begin by calling him "Simon," but after they have intimated the change of name, they always refer to him as "Peter." Thus Mark calls him "Simon" six times at the beginning of his Gospel, but after 3:16 always (twenty times) "Peter." Luke follows the same plan, though he once (5:8) uses "Simon Peter"; he also retains the name "Peter" where he himself speaks of the Apostle in the Acts.

At first sight, the practice of these two evangelists might seem to strengthen the position of those who claim that "Simon" was changed to "Peter" on a definite occasion. But it may also bear another interpretation. If "Peter" or "Simon Peter" gradually —let us say in the course of the first generation of Christians— gained currency for "Simon," the two evangelists were perfectly justified in what they did. When they wrote, the substitution was completed—as is clear from St. Paul, who, writing about 53 A.D. (1 Cor., Gal.), simply calls the Apostle "Kephás" or

"Petros." As historians, they felt obliged to intimate the change of name, but once that was done, they judged it more convenient to use the new name under which the Apostle was known everywhere.

d. Finally, if we examine the *context of Mt. 16:16,* it seems more probable that Jesus meant the first kephá as a common noun, not as a proper name (already bestowed or to be bestowed now). If He had meant it as a proper name, would He have continued: "and upon this kephá"? Would He not rather have said: "Thou art Kephá, and upon thee"? As we know, some Protestants have urged this against the Catholic interpretation. Maldonatus, in answering this objection, says that the force and elegance of the clause (locutionis gratia et energia) would thereby be lost, because buildings are erected on rocks, not on men. The answer is hardly cogent. Jesus evidently spoke metaphorically, and even if He had used Kephá as a proper name, the metaphor would have been evident to His hearers.

And so it seems quite probable that what Jesus said at Caesarea Philippi, was this: *"Thou art a rock,* and upon this rock I will build my Church."

4. And what about the change of name hinted at by the evangelists? The gospel accounts may readily be understood thus: On a *momentous occasion,* Jesus called Simon a kephá, a rock, though in a metaphorical sense; that occasion can hardly have been other than Peter's solemn confession at Caesarea Philippi. In the early Church, Kephá became either a surname ("Simon Peter") or simply a substitute for Simon and thus a proper name. None of the biblical data bearing on the subject oblige us to make the change of name more definite.

Nor are the Fathers more definite. They agree in general that Simon's name was changed to "Peter," and that the change was somehow due to Jesus Himself. But they do not agree on when or how the change was made.[15]

5. But even if this solution of the problem be accepted, our initial question still hangs in the air: How shall we translate Mt. 16:18: "Thou art Peter," or "thou art a rock"?

There can be only one answer: *"Thou art Peter."*

A *translation,* as commonly understood, is neither an explanation nor a paraphrase nor a commentary. While the latter may supply (even at some length) what underlies a text, a simple translation is bound to give, as tersely as possible, its actual sense in the context. Now a proper name is meant in the Latin Vulgate, as is evident. Also in Greek, unless a proper name had been intended, we would certainly read *πέτρα* instead of *πέτρος*; for the Aramaic original had the same word, and Jesus Himself had, most likely, meant it as a common noun. Therefore a simple translation of the Latin or Greek text must needs render it as a proper name. We may admit that some of the force and beauty of Jesus' original saying is thereby lost, particularly in English; but this is a common imperfection of human language. What we should do if we had to translate the Aramaic text of Matthew's Gospel, is another question which need not detain us now. But if I were simply asked what our Lord said to Peter at Caesarea Philippi, then I would not be bound by translations. Then I could answer: Our Lord said to him: "*Thou art a rock,* and upon this rock I will build my church."

---

[15] Knabenbauer, *Comm. in Marcum,* p. 101.

ANTHONY C. COTTER, S.J., S.T.D.

Weston College
Weston, Massachusetts

ANCIENT WISDOM AND MODERN TIMES

I

Admittedly, it is a far cry from the Jerusalem of the second century B.C. to twentieth century New York City. Yet this distance has been bridged, and only recently, by the discovery a few years ago in the Jewish Theological Seminary Library of New York, of a leaf from an ancient Hebrew manuscript, which contains a part of that book of the Old Testament which we Catholics generally call Ecclesiasticus.

This is only one of the many interesting features connected with the book of Ecclesiasticus. It is unfortunate that so little is known by the ordinary man-in-the-street, Catholic and non-Catholic, about a book which has had a most remarkable history, which in ancient times was widely read, which today is so often quoted in the liturgy and which is attracting greater attention in our own time on the part of scholars.

Postponing until later the treatment in a scientific way of the various questions which present themselves in a consideration of Ecclesiasticus, I purpose here rather to offer some of the views of the author of Ecclesiasticus on matters which were of importance in his day, two centuries before the coming of Christ, and which, since they are timeless, are of importance for us today. I like to picture Jesus, the grandson of Sirach (or Sira) as a wise old man, speaking with the experience of years, with that detachment which came from absolute confidence in the truth of what he was saying, warning, encouraging, praising, condemning. In a certain sense, his writings are the most human of all the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament, in that he entered in such minute detail into the daily life of his contemporaries. He was, to use a modern term, a commentator on the foibles and vanities of his day, a shrewd judge of men and customs, one who was guided in all his remarks by divine wisdom and practical human sagacity, a true *hakam.*

It may be fanciful, but I cannot help wondering what he would say if to him should be given the opportunity of coming back to life today and of reviewing the history of his book, which he wrote over two thousand years ago. He would be pleased to see how prominent a part it plays in the liturgy of the New Kingdom and in the New Temple (since he himself had a great love of liturgy), and he would have no hesitation in applying to modern customs the same judicious comments he made for another generation and in another tongue.

The very name of his book is not certain. As said above, in the Catholic Bible it is known today as Ecclesiasticus (not to be confused with Ecclesiastes), while in the Roman Missal it is often referred to merely as the Book of Wisdom. In non-Catholic circles, where it is not looked upon as forming a part of the Old Testament, and among biblical scholars, it has various names: The Wisdom of Sirach, The Wisdom of Jesus, Son of Sira, and finally, Ben Sira, (to mention only the most prominent).

It does seem as though the obscurity of the name itself would indicate that there would be other elements connected with Ecclesiasticus which would prove puzzling, and this indication is verified when we come to consider the manner in which succeeding generations have been made familiar with the observations of this ancient sage, namely by a translation into Greek by a grandson of the author a half century later. Ecclesiasticus is unique in that it has an introduction which is always found with the book itself but which was not written by the sacred author but by his grandson, who did not enjoy the special guidance of God, as did his inspired ancestor. In this introduction, or prologue, the proud grandson tells us of his ancestor, of his love of God and of learning, and of his own eagerness to carry through to a successful conclusion the difficult translation of the book from Hebrew into Greek, in order that the circle of readers might be greatly widened. We can sense the family pride in a gifted member when we read such words as these:[1] "My grandfather, Jesus, after he had devoted himself for a long time to a diligent study of the Law and the Prophets and the other books that have been given to us by our fathers, desired to write something himself, which concerns teaching and wisdom, in order that lovers of learning, who have become acquainted with these things, might be more and more attentive, and encouraged to live according to the Law." And: "I found there books which had been left, of no small or worthless learning." The young man understood the importance of what was written, and as we become more familiar with the book we too shall appreciate how valuable even for us is the advice of this wise old man of pre-Christian times.

---

[1] The quotations from Ecclesiasticus are taken from a proposed revision of the Challoner-Douay Version.

Another matter which would interest our author, if he should return, is the absence of his book from modern non-Catholic bibles. He would, in all humility, ask if he was not gifted by God, as were Moses and the prophets and the writers of the other books of Sacred Scripture, to write something which should be included within the pages of the Bible. He would point to the popularity of his book among those of his fellow-countrymen who spoke in Greek, and to the many references to his writings found among even Palestinian Jews. He would ask how did it come about that while the new Kingdom of God read his book and used it so often from the earliest days, many who call themselves after the Christos either ignore his writings completely or consider them as inferior to the other books of the Bible; formerly all Christians had read his book, now many of them either disregard it entirely or relegate it to a position of secondary importance—as though there could be works of first and second class in the sacred Bible, when all were produced through the special co-operation of God and His servants. What would please him, I know, would be the increasing interest in his writings among scholars, who are appreciating them now more and more as an excellent means to improve our imperfect knowledge of the life and customs, the aspirations and beliefs of the Jewish people in the second century, B.C.

One more thing would Jesus ben Sira find strange, and that is that for the past thousand years the religious world has been, until most recently, unable to read him in his own language. We have in the history of the text of Ecclesiasticus one of the strangest and most intriguing problems in the Old Testament. The author wrote in Hebrew; his grandson translated the work into Greek; others at an early date translated it into other ancient languages. But the western world was ignorant of the Hebrew text from about the time of St. Jerome, toward the close of the fourth century, and although the Hebrew origin of the book was known for a certainty, it was only at the end of the nineteenth century that a considerable portion of the Hebrew text was discovered in Cairo, Egypt, and only a few years ago was a small part discovered in, of all places, the great metropolis of New York City.

There are then many phases of the book of Ecclesiasticus which can interest the scholar and which will repay scientific investigation. Here, however, we would present the views of

Ben Sira in popular fashion, to show that the wise observer of ancient Jerusalem has a word to say to us of the present day and to point out that human nature, being the same today as then, needs someone with authority and wisdom to caution and to counsel, to correct and to guide, someone who can gently point out our failings, smilingly reprove our vanities, courageously oppose our vices, feelingly direct us to the true worship and love of our God. I purposely leave out here a reference to the much-discussed question of the personification or hypostatization of wisdom as found in Ecclesiasticus. My purpose is rather to show how human and simple is Jesus ben Sira, that besides being familiar with the things of God he was also familiar with the things of the world, that, in brief, our author deserves the description we give of him: a wise, shrewd man, full of the wisdom of experience and years.

As the foundation of his temple of wisdom, Ben Sira establishes the fact that without God true wisdom is impossible. One who would hope to be truly wise without postulating the existence and power of God would be indeed illogical and foolish; he would be like one whom another Wise Man later would describe as having built his house on sand, which came crashing into ruins when the rain fell and the floods struck and the winds blew.

"All wisdom is from the LORD God,
and has been always with him, and is from eternity" (1:1)

"The source of wisdom is the word of God on high,
and her ways are the everlasting commandments" (1:5).

"The beginning of wisdom is fear of the LORD" (1:16).

Since wisdom has its origin in God, that wisdom is greatest which influences us to trust in the Creator of wisdom. We may be pictured as wandering and groping in a dark world, but God is all, He is over all, and in His hands are man and his ways (33:14).

Jesus himself, as he tells us in the last chapter of his long treatise, even while he was a young man and before he began his wanderings, sought openly for wisdom in his prayer before the temple, and old and gray that he is when he is writing this, declares his determination to seek her until the very end, that he might never be forsaken and might receive a good possession (51:18-30).

He knows young people; he is aware that youth does not gladly learn, that impetuosity is all too often confused with zeal. Therefore he says:

> "Son, from thy youth embrace learning,
> and even to thy gray hair thou wilt find wisdom."
> "Listen, my son, and accept wise counsel,
> and reject not my advice.
> Put thy feet into her fetters,
> and into her collar thy neck.
> Bow down thy shoulder and carry her,
> and become not disgusted with her chains.
> Come to her with all thy soul,
> and with all thy strength, keep her ways.
> Search for her, and she will be made known to thee,
> and when thou dost possess her, let her not go.
> For in the end thou wilt find rest in her,
> and she will change herself into joy for thee.
> And her fetters will become for thee a strong defence
> and a firm foundation,
> and her collars a glorious robe.
> For the beauty of life is in her,
> and her chains are life-giving bands.
> Thou wilt clothe thyself with her as with a glorious
> robe,
> and thou wilt put her upon thee like a crown of joy"
> (6:18,24-32).

In God is true wisdom to be sought, but God has established a hierarchy of learning among men, and as leaders sit the aged and the experienced. If youth cannot turn directly to God, it can and should turn to those who by their lives are teachers of wisdom:

> "Stay in the company of wise old men,
> and wholeheartedly unite thyself to their wisdom,
> That thou mayst hear every discourse about God,
> and that the proverbs of praise may not escape
> thee.
> And if thou see a man of understanding, go to him early,
> and let thy foot wear out his doorsteps" (6:35,36).

Not only the younger generation but even their elders sometimes become too fond of the things of this world, and in this Ben Sira saw one of the greatest evils which his generation faced. "All flesh grows old like grass" (14:18), he never wearied of repeating. What is the length of man's life here on earth? At the most a hundred years: they are like a drop of water from the sea, like a pebble of the sand (18:8). Does poverty frighten, and riches attract?

"Remember poverty in the time of abundance,
and the wants of poverty in the day of riches.
From morning till evening conditions change,
and all this is swift in the eyes of the LORD"
(18:25,26).

Death is the common end of all, rich and poor:

"Fear not the sentence of death;
remember the things which have been before thee,
and the things which will come after thee;
this is the sentence of the LORD upon all flesh"
(41:5).

It terrifies the wealthy, it releases the poor:

"O death how bitter is the remembrance of thee
to the man who is at peace in his possessions.
O death, welcome is thy sentence
to the man who is in need and whose strength is
failing" (41:1,3).

Nature and experience both speak to us of death and give us constantly this warning: "For me yesterday, and for thee today" (38:23).

Like all true philosophers, Jesus loved to admire God's handiwork in nature, for he saw in creatures some of the beauty and loveliness of the Creator who by His word had called nature into being. The mountains and the hills and the foundations of the earth will tremble and be shaken when God will look upon them. It was He who made them in judgment and beauty. The bright sun, the moon and the stars, the vault of heaven, the waves of the sea, the cedars of Lebanon and the rose plant of Jericho, all are the offspring of His Wisdom when it came forth from His mouth, the first-born of all creatures. In Chapter 43, we have a glorious hymn in praise of God's nature, and yet we are made to feel that words are not able fully to describe our God and His creation;

our knowledge is but a spark (42:23); our words may be many, and yet they fail us. All we can say is simply: "He is in all" (43:29).

In the hierarchy of nature, man stands first. Our author, ever keen to the beauty of inanimate nature and to the failings of man, nevertheless is firm in teaching that man is the crown of God's work, that he has been made only a little lower than the angels, that all things are subject to him. God made man according to His own image; He clothed him with strength, gave him power over all things and dominion over beasts and birds; He gave him wisdom and understanding, the power of speech to praise Him and the power of the spirit to love Him; He gave him a law of life and an everlasting covenant, and then a final command and warning: "Beware of all iniquity" (17:1-11).

Man in God's scheme of things was not to live alone; he was to be what psychologists call a social animal. To him therefore was given a helpmate, and of them were to be born all succeeding generations of mankind. Upon them was to be established the basis of Society, the family. Our biblical philosopher has much to say on the subject of the family, for he attached tremendous importance to it, and he desired all his readers to do likewise.

First of all, the husband should love and cherish his wife:

> "Depart not from a wise and good wife,
> whom thou hast received in the fear of the LORD,
> for the beauty of her modesty is more precious than gold" (7:21).

And blessed indeed is he that lives with an understanding wife; her beauty will gladden his countenance; her soft words will comfort him; she is a fortune dearly to be prized; she is a help and a pillar of rest for him (36:24-26). But as today, so in the author's time there were days when the husband coming home from his labor sought peace and quiet and found instead noise and shouting and sarcasm in his wife's words:

> "There is no head worse than the head of a serpent,
> and there is no anger greater than the anger of a woman.
> It would be more pleasant to live with a lion and a dragon,
> than to dwell with a wicked woman.
> The wickedness of a woman changes her appearance,

and she darkens her countenance like a bear,
and makes it look like sackcloth.
In the midst of his neighbors her husband groaned,
and hearing, he sighed softly.
All malice is small compared to the malice of a woman;
may the lot of sinners fall upon her.
Like a sandy ascent to the feet of an old man,
is a talkative wife to a quiet man" (25:22-27).

Having begun thus to describe a happy and an unhappy household, the sage then presents his views on children. Never too lenient, he would, I am sure, anger the proponents of some of the modern theories regarding child welfare and child care: Be stern and strict; bend their necks from their youth, for it is better to die without children than to have ungodly children. And note this well in a nation famous for its large families:

"For one child that fears God is better
than a thousand ungodly children" (16:3).

Badly trained children are a disgrace and a shame; therefore:

"He that loves his son often chastises him.
Pamper thy son, and he will make thee tremble;
beat his sides while he is a child,
lest he become stubborn and disobey thee,
and sorrow of heart be thine" (30:1,9,12).

And daughters can be doubly troublesome and a source of even greater anxiety; if boys are to be watched, girls, as youngsters and even as young brides, are always to be guarded (42:9-11). In the mind of Ben Sira, the father is the head of the family and must exercise constant vigilance and control over wife and children. In this way will the reputation of the family be preserved and its name honored by succeeding generations (41:15,16).

I am afraid that all the views on servants, which are presented in Ecclesiasticus, would by no means find ready acceptance today in every circle:

"Fodder and stick and load are for an ass;
bread and discipline and work, for a servant.
He works under discipline and looks for rest;
let his hands be idle, and he looks for freedom.
A yoke and a lash bend a stiff neck,
and unremitting toil bows down a servant.

Torture and fetters are for an offending servant;
set him to work, that he be not idle;
for idleness has taught much evil" (33:25-29).
"Be not ashamed.......................
....of making the side of a wicked servant bleed"
(42:5c).

But that this severity was softened by a spirit of fairness and true charity (which was not too common, at least among the pagans of the period) is evidenced by such words as these:

"Let the wise servant be as dear to thee as thy own soul,
defraud him not of his freedom,
and leave him not in want" (7:23).
"If thou hast a servant, let him be to thee as thy own soul;
treat him like a brother,
because with the blood of life thou hast bought him" (33:31).

And we can see too the practical man that Ben Sira was in the advice which he gives against cruelty towards servants:

"If thou injure him unjustly, he will run away;
and if he rise up and depart,
thou wilt not know whom to ask or where to look for him" (33:32,33).

We are all familiar with that type of man who outside of his family circle is considered most charming and affable, but who with his wife and children is a veritable tyrant. Our author does not permit such a man to escape his biting words, but bids all not to be like a lion at home, upsetting the members of the household and oppressing those who are subject to them (4:35). One is to direct and guide his children and to care for those of his household, and so he will win the approval of God and men (25:1,2).

If parents owe a duty to their children, most certainly children owe, if anything, an even greater duty to their parents:

"My children, hearken to the judgment of your father,
and act accordingly, that you may be saved.
For God has made the father worthy of honor among his children,

and has strongly confirmed the authority of the mother over her sons.
He that loves God will pray for pardon for his sins,
and will keep himself from them,
and in his daily prayer he will be heard.
Like the man that heaps up riches
is the one that honors his mother.
He that honors his father will have joy in his own children,
and in the day of his prayer he will be heard.
He that honors his father will live a long life,
and he that obeys his father will be a comfort to to his mother.
He that fears the LORD honors his parents,
and serves them who bore him, as his masters.
In work and word and all patience honor thy father,
that a blessing may come upon thee from him,
and his blessing remain unto the end.
A father's blessing establishes the houses of his children,
but a mother's curse uproots their foundations.
Glory not in thy father's disgrace,
for his shame is no glory to thee.
For the glory of a man comes from the honor of his father,
and a father without honor is a disgrace for the son.
Son, take care of thy father in his old age,
and grieve him not during his life.
And if his understanding fail, be patient,
and despise him not, when thou art in thy strength,
for mercy to a father shall not be forgotten.
And a reward shall be given thee for bearing with the sin of thy mother.
And thou shalt be built up in justice,
and in the day of tribulation thou shalt be remembered,
and like ice in fair weather, thy sins shall melt away.

How wicked is the reputation of him that abandons
his father,
and cursed by the LORD is he that angers his
mother" (3:2-18).

God had commanded all children to honor their father and their mother; now Jesus repeats this precept:

"With thy whole heart, honor thy father,
and forget not the pains of thy mother" (7:29);

and gives a reason for it:

"Remember that but for them thou wouldst not have
been born,
and repay them what they have done for thee" (7:30).

Moreover, the great tragedy that so often comes to father and mother would be avoided if all children who rise to a position of greatness would hearken to his words:

"Remember thy father and thy mother,
when thou sittest in the midst of the great;
lest God forget thee in their presence,
and thou, infatuated by thy familiarity, suffer reproach,
and wish that thou hadst not been born,
and curse the day of thy birth" (23:18,19).

We do not know how widespread sexual abuse was in the second century B.C. among the Jews, but we have in Ecclesiasticus many warnings against this sin. The author evidently felt that because of Syrian influence upon his people, the door of this evil might be flung open and God's chosen become a nation of fornicators and adulterers:

"Look not upon a woman that has a mind for many men,
lest thou fall into her snares.
Keep not company with a dancing-girl,
and hearken not to her,
lest thou perish through her charms.
Gaze not upon a virgin,
lest her beauty be a stumbling-block to thee.
Give not thy soul to harlots in any way,
lest thou destroy thyself and thy inheritance.
Look not around in the alleys of the city,
and wander not up and down in its streets.

> Turn away thy face from a comely woman,
> and gaze not upon the beauty of another's wife.
> Because of a woman's beauty many have perished,
> and by it lust is kindled like a fire.
> Every woman that is a harlot
> will be trodden down, like dung on the street.
> Many by admiring the beauty of another's wife have become reprobate,
> for her conversation burns like fire.
> Never sit with another's wife,
> and lie not with her upon a couch.
> And dispute not with her while at wine,
> lest thy heart turn toward her,
> and with thy blood thou fall into ruin" (9:3-13).

He compares sins of the flesh to a burning fire that consumes all before it; it penetrates the darkness of walls and forces the guilty to stand, shame-faced, before the all-seeing God, and to be chased like a colt before a wrathful people (23:22-31). The description of an unfaithful woman reads almost like a tract in Moral Theology or like a treatise in law:

> "So also every woman that leaves her husband,
> and presents an heir through a marriage with another.
> For, firstly, she has been disobedient to the Law of the Most High;
> secondly, she has wronged her husband;
> thirdly, she has committed adultery by her immorality,
> and she has presented herself with children by another man.
> This woman will be brought into the assembly,
> and a visitation will come upon her children.
> Her children will not take root,
> and her branches will bring forth no fruit.
> She will leave her memory to be cursed,
> and her disgrace will not be blotted out" (23:32-36).

(*To be continued*)

MATTHEW P. STAPLETON, S.T.D., S.S.L.

St. John's Seminary
Brighton, Mass.

THE SIN OF ONAN, GEN. 38:8-10

The late Pope Pius XI in his memorable encyclical *Casti Connubii* reaffirmed the age-old teaching of the Catholic Church regarding the sanctity of marriage. Moreover, in no uncertain terms, and with unhesitating candor, he roundly condemned certain modern abuses that tend to degrade the dignity of matrimony. Speaking of the vices opposed to Christian marriage the Holy Father said: "Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious."[1] In the following paragraph of the same encyclical he continued: "Intercourse even with one's legitimate wife is unlawful and wicked where the conception of offspring is prevented. Onan, the son of Juda, did this and the Lord killed him for it." It is this later statement that particularly interests us here. The Sovereign Pontiff apparently appeals to Gen. 38:8-10 as a scriptural argument against birth prevention. He takes it for granted that Onan sinned against the dignity of marriage by that act which since has come to bear his name, *onanism,* and that for this reason the Lord slew him. Now although such an interpretation is traditional amongst Catholics, and is appealed to by most Catholic authors who present the case against birth control, it is not infrequently questioned by non-Catholics, and even, we have heard, by some Catholics who hesitate to use this text as an argument against birth prevention. Therefore, it would seem not inopportune to examine the whole question as thoroughly and objectively as possible, with the purpose of aiding any preachers or popular writers who may be in doubt about the interpretation of Gen. 38:8-10. In this connection we might add that it is fully realized that the above-mentioned preachers and writers cannot be expected to submit the text, in their sermons and popular pamphlets, to as searching an analysis as we shall attempt here. However, we do assert that they should know on what grounds their interpretation is based, for here, as elsewhere, their conclusions are only as good as the foundation on which they rest. The purpose of this article, then, will be to seek an answer to the question: what was the sin of Onan, or why was he killed by the Lord? That a satisfactory reply to this question be found, is all the more important in that Gen. 38:8-10 is the only scriptural proof ordinarily adduced in the case against birth prevention.

---

[1] *Casti Connubii,* Completely Revised Translation (New York: America Press, 1936), p. 17.

At first sight it would seem that the whole discussion is pointless, for in the words of the Vulgate, Onan "did a detestable thing, and therefore the Lord slew him." Hence it would seem clear that God killed Onan because of his abuse of the conjugal act. Leaving aside for the moment, however, the fact that the Vulgate rendering is rather free, there is another and more important fact to be noticed. It is the inescapable fact of the context. Now, it is one of the first and most important, even though most obvious, rules of interpretation, that a given text must be interpretated in the light of its context. It is because of this that there is a real problem before us in our text of Genesis. The immediate context apparently gives another reason (according to some, the only reason) for Onan's punishment by God. On the death of Onan's brother, Her, it became Onan's duty by virtue of a custom then recognized to marry his dead brother's widow. In virtue of the same custom any children born of this marriage (or at least the firstborn male) would bear the name of the dead brother, Her. Now Onan knowing this, deliberately frustrated the marriage act lest children be born in his brother's name; thereby failing against the levirate custom; and so was killed by God. His sin, therefore, was one of egoism and failure to observe the levirate custom, for this he was slain. All of which puts quite a different complexion on things, and if true, it rather neatly dissolves the efficacy of this passage as an argument against birth prevention. Since the whole question depends first of all on a correct interpretation of the immediate context, or better, of the text in the light of its context, and since the context concerns the institution known as levirate marriage we shall now examine this interesting custom.

THE CONTEXT

1. At that time Juda went down from his brethren, and turned in to a certain Odollamite, named Hiras. 2. And he saw there the daughter of a man of Chanaan, called Sue: and taking her to wife, he went in unto her. 3. And she conceived, and bore a son, and called his name Her. 4. And conceiving again, she bore a son, and called him Onan. 5. She bore also a third: whom she called Sela. After whose birth,

she ceased to bear any more. 6. And Juda took a wife for Her, his firstborn, whose name was Thamar. 7. And Her, the firstborn of Juda, was wicked in the sight of the Lord: and was slain by him. 8. Juda therefore said to Onan his son: Go in to thy brother's wife and marry her, that thou mayst raise seed to thy brother. 9. He knowing that the children should not be his, when he went in to his brother's wife, spilled his seed upon the ground, lest children should be born in his brother's name. 10. And therefore the Lord slew him, because he did a detestable thing. 11. Wherefore Juda said to Thamar his daughter-in-law: Remain a widow in thy father's house, till Sela my son grow up. For he was afraid lest he also might die, as his brethren did. She went her way and dwelt in her father's house.

At this point, and before a careful examination of the text (vv. 8-10) has been made, there will be no attempt at a strict interpretation. This will be done later. Here the aim will be simply to shed light, in as far as is possible, on the historical setting presupposed by the context.

Juda, the fourth son of the patriarch Jacob and the father of the tribe that bore his name, left his brethren in Hebron and came to the town of Odollam.[2] There he formed a friendship with a certain Hiras, and there, too, he married the daughter of a Canaanite named Sue.[3] By her Juda had three sons, Her, Onan and Sela; the last being born while Juda was at Kezib.[4] For his firstborn, Her, Juda chose a wife called Thamar. But Her was wicked in the sight of Yahweh and was slain by him. The nature of Her's crime is not described in the text, but it must have been very grave to merit so serious a punishment. On the death of Her, Juda gave his second son, Onan, to Thamar in marriage with the injunction, "that thou mayst raise seed to thy brother." But Onan did not wish his children to have his brother's name and so frustrated the marital act, and Yahweh slew him also. Whereupon Juda appears under the necessity of giving Thamar to his third and youngest son in marriage, but fears to do so lest he should follow the same fate as his older brothers. To get around the difficulty Juda tells Thamar to wait until his youngest son, Sela, is grown up, and so Thamar returns as a widow to live in her father's house.

---

[2] Possibly *'Id el-Miyye*. Cf. Szczepanski, *Geographia Historica Palaestinae Antiquae* (Rome: Pont. Bibl. Institute, 1926), pp. 127; 190; Also: J. Skinner, *Genesis* (International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912) p. 450;—a town S. W. of Bethlehem. The spelling varies in Vulg.: Adullam, Odullam, Odollam. Hetzenauer, *Commentarius in Librum Genesis* (Vienna: 1910), p. 539, locates it at the site of the cave where David took refuge (1 Kgs. 22:1) but this is against Hummelauer, *Commentarius in Genesim* (Cursus S. Sacrae), p. 532, who prefers to locate the cave nearer Bethlehem.

[3] According to LXX, Sue is the name of the woman Juda married, but in MT it is the name of her father, the Canaanite. In view of v. 12, this latter is the correct reading.

[4] The Vulg., "quo nato parere ultra cessavit," is probably incorrect, and MT to be preferred, which reads the place-name Kezib (Archzib?) instead of "cessavit." In LXX it is the woman who is at Kezib and she gives birth to the three sons at that place.

Among many things debatable in this passage there is one that cannot be questioned: at the time of Juda levirate marriage was a firmly established custom amongst the Hebrews. Juda quite naturally, and as if to fulfill an obligation, gives his second son, Onan, to Thamar on the death of her first husband, Her. The purpose is to "raise seed to thy brother." What was this interesting levirate custom and when did it arise?

Levirate marriage, until fairly recent times considered as rather a curiosity of antiquity, has been shown by modern investigation to have been quite prevalent at certain stages of civilization and to have had no little importance. Its early origins are obscure, but it is now known that it was not restricted to the Hebrews. Recent discoveries have shown that it was in vogue amongst peoples by no means connected with Israel, for example, the Mongols, Caucasians, the peoples of the ancient Indies and Persia,[5] and also amongst the early inhabitants of Italy.[6] In 1920 Otto Schroeder[7] published the cuneiform text of the laws of the Assyrians, and later, P. Cruveilhier[8] compared the Assyrian law relative to levirate marriage with that of the Hebrews. Further, a collection of the laws of the Hittites was found on the site of the ancient capital of these peoples near Boghazkoi in Asia Minor, and in 1921 the cuneiform text of their laws was published by F. Hrozny. In both the Assyrian and Hittite laws similar prescriptions to the Mosaic regulations regarding levirate marriage are found.

---

[5] Cf. Hummelauer, *Commentarius in Deuteronomium*, p. 471, who cites Dillman and Driver. Cf. also, W. P. Paterson, "Marriage," *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Hastings, p. 269.

[6] Cf. Lesêtre, "Lévirat," *Dict. de la Bible*, Vigoroux, col. 214.

[7] Cf. J. B. Schaumberger, "Propter quale peccatum morte punitus sit Onan," *Biblica*, VIII (1927), pp. 209ff.

[8] P. Cruveilhier, "Le Lévirat chez les Hébreux et chez les Assyriens," *Revue Biblique*, XXXIV (1925), pp. 542ff.

In the Scriptures we find references to the custom in pre-Mosaic times, in the Mosaic law, and also in post-Mosaic times. 1) For pre-Mosaic times, our example in Genesis 38 which dates to patriarchal times, several centuries before Moses, shows the custom as not only in existence, but well established, since there is no evidence in the text that it is of recent origin, and the use of a technical verb (יבם—to perform the levirate duty) suggests something long in use. 2) For the Mosaic period we have the explicit incorporation of levirate marriage in the laws of Moses (Deut. 25:5-10). 3) For the third, or post-Mosaic times, we have the narrative of Ruth and the allusions to the custom in the parallel places of the N.T. (Mt. 22:23-33; Mk. 12:18-27; Lk. 20:27-40). A brief survey of the custom amongst the Hebrews as compared with the laws of the Hittites and Assyrians will help us to understand the full import of our context.

1) The passage in Gen. 38 under consideration is the first example of the levirate custom in the Bible. Her, the firstborn of Juda, dies, and Juda gives his second son, Onan, to the widow, Thamar, in marriage. Onan was, of course, the brother-in-law of Thamar and it is this relationship that has given the name to the custom: levirate marriage, from *levir,* Latin for brother-in-law. There is no indication in the text as to when this custom originated, and certainly no evidence, as some suggest, that it was connected with a system of ancestor-worship or was a survival from polyandry. The custom is simply taken for granted by the text as something firmly established. There is no attempt either on the part of Juda or his sons at a legal evasion, even though Onan's action suggests that the custom was difficult, especially in its effects. The father, Juda, is the executor, handing over his second son to the widow without question. The purpose of the custom is clearly indicated: the dead brother's name is to be perpetuated, and so the issue of the marriage of Onan and Thamar shall bear Her's name. Juda apparently acts as if under obligation, as if the levirate custom had the force of law. This is seen more clearly still in the sequence, for when Thamar deceives Juda he admits that "she is juster than I: because I did not give to Sela my son" (v. 26). Obviously, then, Juda should have given Thamar to his third son, Sela, but hesitated to do so lest he too should be killed like his brothers. This leads us to believe, also, that Juda was not sincere in his reason to Thamar (v. 11) that his son Sela was too young to marry.

2) The only reference to levirate marriage in the Mosaic law is found in Deut. 25:5, and is well known:

> 5. When brethren dwell together, and one of them dieth without children, the wife of the deceased shall not marry to another: but his brother shall take her, and raise up seed for his brother. 6. And the first son he shall have of her he shall call by his name: that his name be not abolished out of Israel. 7. But if he will not take his brother's wife who by law belongeth to him, the woman shall go to the gate of the city, and call upon the ancients and say: my husband's brother refuseth to raise up his brother's name in Israel: and will not take me to wife. 8. And they shall cause him to be sent for forthwith, and shall ask him. If he answer: I will not take her to wife: 9. The woman shall come to him before the ancients, and shall take off his shoe from his foot, and spit in his face, and say: So shall it be done to the man that will not build up his brother's house. 10. And his name shall be called in Israel, the house of the unshod.

In this section from the Mosaic law, the law-giver Moses is prescribing an already-existing custom. He is dignifying it with the force of law. His words are clear and explicit and quite detailed. Moreover, he includes the sanction in the law itself. This sanction or penalty is severe enough: if the man refuse his duty, the woman brings him before the ancients in a public place and there she publicly insults him. The removal of the shoe was a sort of degradation of the man and indicated a loss of power and reduction to a low status, which is perpetuated by his being called the "unshod." Spitting in the face (or "before him" as the text might be translated) was considered by orientals as a sign of utter detestation and contempt.

Comparing the law of Moses with the passage from Gen. 38, we find no essential differences. True, the Mosaic law is more detailed, but it is not the purpose of the author in Gen. 38 to give a complete description of the custom; it is rather to recount a practical application of the law, or custom which had the force of law. There is at least no proof that Deut. 25:5 is a development, or that the sanction is something new. It could well have been simply an incorporation of a custom such as already existed in patriarchal times and no doubt even before that. The fuller description in the law of Moses does, however, lead to more difficulties. At first sight it seems to contradict the prescription of the law in Lev. 18:16; 20:21, where marriage with a brother's wife is forbidden. The best solution of this apparent clash of laws seems to lie in an interpretation of Deut. 25:5 as a particular exception to the general prohibition of Leviticus. A further difficulty is in the words "when brethren dwell together, and one of them dieth without children." The first part is clear enough: it regards only those brothers who lived together on the paternal estate or at least in the same locality. Brothers living in different countries were not bound by the law. Regarding the second part of the sentence, "without children," it should be noted that the Hebrew has "without a son," LXX reads "without issue" (σπέρμα), while Vulg. has "without children." MT is, likely, the better reading here, and so, strictly, if the brother died leaving only daughters as heirs the living brother would still be obliged to perform the levirate duty. However, later practice obligated the brother-in-law only if the deceased brother died without issue. Besides it seems clear, even though not explicitly so stated, that the man was not obligated to marry the widow if he were already married; otherwise the law would have prescribed bigamy. It is not clear from Deut. whether all the remaining brothers would be bound in turn as seems the case in Gen. 38, although it is quite conformable to the text of the law.

The purpose of the Mosaic prescription is mentioned in Deut. as being, "that his name (the dead brother's name) be not abolished out of Israel." As interpreted, this signifies a desire on the part of the legislator to obtain more than a mere sentimental continuance of the dead brother's name. It aimed at keeping the family possessions in the same family and thus avoiding the usual disputes attendant on inheritance. No doubt, as Kortleitner[9] points out, the intention of preserving the name was connected with the Hebrew opinion that the immortality of the name and eternal honor were contained in the genealogical tables. In any case, as Cruveilhier[10] notes, the Hebrew law proceeded from a delicate charity for the deceased brother, who would not die feeling that his name would be forever extinct, but would have the consolation of knowing that he would have a posterity as similar as possible to that which he himself would have generated.

3) The only other biblical references to levirate marriage are found in the Book of Ruth and in the N. T. Most admit that the Book of Ruth contains an application of the levirate law, some

[9] F. X. Kortleitner, *Archaeologia Biblica* (Innsbruck: 1917), p. 563.

[10] *Op. cit.*, p. 545.

few contending that it does not. If it does, it certainly shows an extension of the law as prescribed in Deut., since in Ruth the obligation would extend to remote relatives in the case where brothers of the deceased did not exist. Besides, the penalty is not as severe and more liberty seems to be given to the man to refuse the duty. If this is really an application of the law, it seems that the Mosaic law had already begun to lapse or that perhaps due to the difficulty of the law its observance was not so strict.

In the N. T. (Mt. 22:23-33; Mk. 12:18-27; Lk. 20:27-40) the Sadducees propose an objection to the doctrine of the resurrection drawn from the Mosaic law regarding levirate marriage. From the tenor of the objection of the Sadducees, it would seem that the law was still observed at the time of Christ, and, moreover, that it was so interpreted that all the surviving brothers of the deceased man were bound in order, and hence that the obligation was not restricted simply to the oldest surviving brother. This is in line with the case observed in Gen. 38.

The recent investigations made concerning the laws of the Hittites and Assyrians will enable us to attempt a brief comparison between the levirate custom as observed by the Hebrews and as contained in the laws of these other ancient peoples.[11] The Hittite law respecting levirate marriage is somewhat later than Mosaic times, but it probably dates back to the time of Moses, or even before it. The one interesting difference between the Hittite prescription and that of Moses is that in the Hittite law the father of the deceased husband is bound to marry the widow if the usual brothers are lacking. This is of special interest in our case in Gen. 38. Thamar being a non-Israelite and from a territory that the Hittites inhabited, could it have been that she herself belonged to this nation and so regulated her conduct by its laws? This cannot be demonstrated, but at least it is an interesting side-light on her later conduct (Gen. 29:13 ff.) with her father-in-law, and may perhaps absolve her from the usual stigma of incest attached to her conduct with Juda.. Since she felt she had a right to issue from Juda by law, she was at least in intention not guilty of incest. Juda's statement, "she is juster than I," is hardly an approval of her conduct with him but rather a reference to Juda's insincere refusel to give Thamar to his third son, Sela. A further point worthy of note here is that there is no indication of any sanction attaching to the Hittite levirate law.

---

[11] Cf. Cruveilhier, *op. cit., passim;* and Shaumberger, *op. cit.,* p. 210-211.

The Assyrian laws regarding levirate marriage date to about the time of Moses and like the Hittite law show characteristic differences from Hebrew custom and law. In the Assyrian statutes the brother of the deceased husband is bound to espouse the widow, but the purpose of the law is clearly diverse from that of the Hebrews. The purpose of the Assyrian law, and perhaps also of that of the Hittites, is to recover the money paid by the father of the husband for the wife previous to the marriage ceremony. The woman at the marriage was in a sense bought and paid for, and hence if her husband died, the father of the dead husband reclaimed the price paid by giving the widow in marriage to his other sons. This is altogether different from Deut. where no such custom of payment for the woman was prescribed and where charity toward the deceased brother is the main purpose of the law. Again, for the Assyrians as for the Hittites, we find no mention of a sanction or penalty for the non-observance of the levirate duty.

A summary of the facts contained in our context and as enlightened from other sources can now be given. Levirate marriage is a very ancient custom not limited to the Hebrew nation and found in somewhat variant forms in the Bible and non-biblical sources. In our passage (Gen. 38), it clearly obligates a brother-in-law to marry the widow of his dead brother, that his dead brother's name might be perpetuated. Onan, therefore, had a clear duty to marry Thamar on Her's death, and on the death of Onan the duty apparently devolved on the youngest brother, Sela. Nor is the father Juda, himself, free from obligation, since his duty appears to be the handing over of the widow to his sons: a duty, as it were, of obtaining by parental authority the observance of a custom that even at this time had the force of law. A comparison of the Hebrew law with that of the Assyrians and Hittites shows the custom to have been in existence amongst all three, with this noticeable difference that neither the Hittite nor Assyrian law carried any sanction for failure in the levirate duty.

In Gen. 38 Onan is killed by God as was his brother Her. Does the context show that Onan was killed solely or principally because he failed in his duty of fraternal charity to his dead brother? This is the question for us to decide, and the deciding of it one way or the other will show the efficacy or non-efficacy of this passage as an argument against the sexual aberration called *onanism.* No matter how the question is settled we must certainly bear in mind all the data yielded by the context, and in this regard we will not help matters by attempting to show that levirate marriage was a curious anomaly that had little importance. This cannot be done. Levirate marriage was an important institution and Onan surely failed against it by his conduct. But did God kill him for this failure, or is the severe penalty applied for some other reason? To answer this adequately we must subject the text itself (vv. 8-10) to the closest sort of scrutiny.

THE TEXT

Coming now to the heart of the problem, the text itself, it will be necessary to examine this carefully in the light of the Hebrew original. Only then can the full force of the text be felt and an accurate interpretation of it be attempted. We transcribe verses 8-10 from Kittel:[12]

8. ויאמר יהודה לאונן בא אל־אשת אחיך
ויבם אתה והקם זרע לאחיך:
9. וידע אונן כי לא לו יהיה הזרע
והיה אם־בא אל־אשת אחיו ושחת
ארצה לבלתי נתן־זרע לאחיו:
10. וירע בעיני יהוה אשר עשה וימת גם־אתו:

Kittel's apparatus shows no variation in these two verses, and LXX agrees substantially with MT. There is, therefore, no problem of textual criticism before us. Let us, therefore, before proceeding to the actual interpretation of the text, see what a verbal analysis of the Hebrew will net us.

v. 8. ויבם—Juda tells Onan to take his brother's wife . . . ויבם—this is a denominative form from the noun *יבם meaning "husband's brother," hence "brother-in-law" (lat. *levir,* "brother-in-law"); with verbal force it becomes (found only in *Piel*): "to perform the levirate function," or "take a brother's widow in marriage." This verb form is rare and technical, occurring elsewhere only in Deut. 25:5,7. LXX follows the Hebrew literally with the unusual, in this technical sense: γάμβρευσαι (γαμβρευσον D) from γαμβρός

---

[12] Kittel, *Genesis* (3d. ed., *Biblica Hebraica;* Stuttgart: 1929).

—"any one connected by marriage," hence "brother-in-law."

v. 9. אם־בא—Onan knew that the fruit of his marriage with Thamar should not be his, and so: והיה אם־בא i.e. "whenever (whensoever, as often as) he went in," viz. to the wife of his dead brother, etc. Clearly we have here an example of the conditional particle אם being used in the temporal, frequentative sense of "whenever," "as often as." This undoubtedly implies that Onan acted thus more than once (cf. Joüon[13] and Gesenius-Kautzsch[14] for this usage). LXX has *ὅταν εἰσήρχετο.*

ושחת—a rather odd, euphemistic usage of the verb שׁחת omitting the object *semen.* It means "spoil" or "waste." With the following ארצה it amounts to, *"corrumpebat terram versus,"* or "perdebat in terram," *semen* always understood. Clearly, then, a deliberate and abusive wasting of the *semen* is meant. The Vulg. *fundebat,* and LXX *ἐξέχεεν,* express substantially the same idea as the Hebrew, although MT brings out the notion of "wastefulness" more clearly.

לבלתי נתן—expresses the purpose of the preceding action: "lest he should give," "that he might not give." The use of the infinitive in *o,* נתן for תת, is rare and occurs elsewhere only in Num. 20:21.[15]

v. 10. וירע בעיני ״׳—"it was wicked in the sight of Yahweh that which he did." St. Jerome rendered this verse freely in the Vulgate but quite legitimately *sec. sensum.* The בעיני ״׳ has the force of "truly": it was "truly" or "objectively" wicked. As for וירע, denominative from רע, it expresses the notion of "to be evil," "to be ethically wicked." It should be noted also that it was *what he did* (אשר עשׂה) that was wicked in the sight of Yahweh. LXX in E and perhaps also in D adds *τὸ ῥῆμα,* suggesting, of course, the Hebrew הדבר, and making it even more emphatic that it was *what he did* that was wicked.

---

[13] Jouon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique* (Rome: Pont. Bibl. Inst., 1923), §§. 166p; 167.

[14] Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (2d. Engl. ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), § 159°.

[15] Cf. Joüon, *op. cit.*, §§ 160 l; 12 i.

> וימת גם־אתו—"and he (Yahweh) killed him also." The use of the *hiphil* here may possibly permit the question to be raised whether Yahweh really *slew* Onan or simply permitted him to die prematurely. The case of Onan here is quite analogous to that of Her in verse 7, and the verb מות in the *hiphil* is used in both instances. Relative to Her, Skinner[16] has: "No crime is alleged against *'Er*, whose untimely death was probably the only evidence of Yahweh's displeasure with him." This is hardly true, since Her is also″' רע בעיני, i.e. "wicked in the sight of Yahweh." The similarity of the expressions there and here in verse 10 make it seem certain that Her and Onan were guilty of the same crimes. Therefore, despite Skinner's statement, and Hummelauer,[17] who has regarding Her: "non cogimur intelligere mortem violentam, sed praematuram liberisque carentem," we feel certain with Corn. a Lapide[18] that both Her and Onan committed the same sin and so were killed by God. The expression is the same in both instances and there can scarcely be reasonable doubt that the verb form used has the force of "kill" or "slay" and not simply "let die," i.e. prematurely. The use of the verb מות in the hiphil with the meaning of "kill" can be clearly seen, v.g. in: Ex. 1:16; Lev. 20:4 etc., (cf. B.D.B.[19]) where punishment is meted out by authority; or in: Deut. 32:39; 1 Kgs. 2:6; 4 Kgs. 5:7 etc., where God, inflicting the penalty of death, is the subject of the verb, just as he is in our case.

With this textual analysis before us we arrive at the following rendering of the Hebrew:

38:8. And Juda said to Onan: Go in to thy brother's wife and perform the levirate duty (towards) her, and raise up seed to thy brother.

9. And Onan knew that the seed should not be his: and it came to pass as often as he went in to his brother's

---

[16] J. Skinner, *op. cit.*, p. 451.

[17] *Commentarius in Genesim.*

[18] Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentaria in S. Sacram: Genesis* (Paris: ed. Vivès, 1868).

[19] Brown-Driver-Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), *s.v.* מות

wife he spoiled (his seed) on the ground lest he should give seed to his brother.

10. And what he did was wicked in the sight of Yahweh and he (Yahweh) slew him also.

INTERPRETATION

The interpretation of the above three verses of Gen. 38 in the light of their context can be reduced to the problem: why did God kill Onan? Was it because he failed against the levirate duty or because he failed against the law of nature? If we open the Fathers to find an answer to the question, we notice that most of the Fathers who have a commentary on Genesis do not spend much time on these verses, but seem more concerned with explaining the difficulty raised by the apparently incestuous relations between Juda and his daughter-in-law, Thamar, in the verses which follow our passage. As for verses 8-10, St. J. Chrysostom's commentary[20] on these is perhaps typical of the Fathers. He writes of Onan simply: "Verum et hunc, quia malus erat, occidit Dominus"; which, of course, does not help us a great deal. Can we say, then, that there is a Catholic tradition regarding the interpretation of this text? Yes, indeed, for of all the Catholic interpreters of this text we cannot find one that would claim that Onan was killed principally because he failed against the levirate duty. They all mention as the reason for Onan's punishment, his sin against nature. We have no hesitation in saying, therefore, that to assign as the sole reason of Onan's punishment the fact that he failed in his levirate duty would be at least to go against the common teaching of Catholic doctors and exegetes. It is undoubtedly this common teaching of Catholic scholars that the Holy Father had in mind when he used this text in his encyclical *Casti Connubii.* There is one point of interest, however, in this connection that should be noted: some few Catholic commentators seem to assign as the sole reason for Onan's punishment his moral turpitude, even though they do not expressly exclude the possibility of the punishment also being directed against his levirate failure. Others, we think more accurately, say that Onan was killed *principally* because of his immoral action and *secondarily,* or also, because he did not fulfill the levirate obligation. Cruveilhier has expressed this latter view as well as anyone when he writes:

---

[20] *Homiliae in Genesim:* Homil. LXII; MPG 54, 532.

> Assuredly it was through egoism that Onan refused to fulfill his duty as brother-in-law and consequently gave himself over to an immoral practice. Nevertheless the natural law and the deuteronomical code (Deut. 25:5-10) indicate clearly that it is the crime against nature that God punished with death. The lack of fraternal charity on the part of Onan was chastised so severely only because it occasioned a grave violation of the moral law.[21]

Of the non-Catholic authors that we have been able to consult, and we admit that we have been somewhat handicapped in this investigation due to circumstances of time and place, we have been able to find only one that expressly excludes moral turpitude as the sin of Onan in this passage. This one is Hermann Gunkel, and he gives his opinion in no uncertain terms: "His (Onan's) sin, therefore, is lack of charity towards his dead brother, not the sexual crime that has been named after him."[22] The idea being that since Onan had a duty of charity towards his dead brother, Her, by reason of the levirate obligation, in refusing this obligation Onan sinned against Her, and this was his only sin. Other non-Catholic authors do not agree with Gunkel and say so distinctly, v.g. Skinner[23] who has: "It is not correct to say (with Gunkel) that his *only* offence was his selfish disregard of his deceased brother's interests"; and Procksch[24] who writes: "Onan's crime, 'onanism,' being against nature, is surely also a moral crime (v. 10 אשר עשה against Gunkel) which is self-evident to any sound morality." These authors, of course, agree with Gunkel that Onan was punished because of his egoism and lack of charity, but they insist that this is not his only crime. Driver[25] and others merely explain the custom of levirate marriage without saying why God killed Onan. Recent, popular, Protestant commentaries, whether by design or omission we cannot say, observe strict silence regarding the nature of Onan's sin.[26]

---

[21] P. Cruveilhier, *op. cit.*, p. 526; cf. also, besides the authors already cited, P. Heinisch, *Das Buch Genesis* (Bonn. 1930) p. 356.

[22] H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Handkommentar zum A. T.; 5th ed. Gottingen: 1922), p. 413.

[23] *Op. cit.*, p. 452.

[24] O. Procksch, *Die Genesis übersetzt und erklärt* (Kommentar zum A. T. von E. Sellin: 1924), p. 209.

[25] S. R. Driver, *Genesis* (Westminster Commentaries, London: 1904), p. 328.

What, then, shall we say of Onan, why was he killed by God? It is our opinion that: A. Onan was punished by God *principally* because of his crime against the natural law, and B. *secondarily* because he failed to fulfill the levirate duty. Our reasons for this stand are the following:

A. 1) In interpreting any given text of Sacred Scripture the first thing to bear in mind is the exact statement of the text itself. The interpretation must depend not on what we should like the text to mean, no matter how good our intention, but on what it is in itself, what the text itself says. In our case this point is clear for v. 10 says: "And what *he did* was wicked in the sight of Yahweh, and he slew him also." What Onan did, therefore, was objectively wicked, wicked in the eyes of God, and so God killed him for it. What Onan did was to waste his seed on the ground; this constituted an offence against the natural law, and for this was Onan killed. To twist the text from what it says, to what we want it to say, is not only the source of faulty or inadequate interpretation but it is also to proceed unscientifically. We think, therefore, that to limit Onan's sin to one simply of egoism or lack of fraternal charity constitutes an unscientific interpretation of the text.

This simple statement of the text, then, becomes the basis for a fuller interpretation, but the statement itself must never be forgotten. Therefore, the wickedness of Onan, and the severity of the punishment, can be more fully understood as we go on to group around the basic statement of the text other accompanying factors. For example, the heinousness of the crime and the aptness of the punishment stand out more clearly as we realize that the text contains the notion of repetition. The Hebrew shows us that Onan repeated his wicked action: "as often as he went in to his brother's wife," etc. Onan, therefore, was killed because he repeatedly performed a shameful act, which act was wicked in the eyes of God.

---

[26] Cf. *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* (London: 1919), p. 162; C. Gore, H. Leighton Goudge, A Guillaume, *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1929), p. 61; ed. J. R. Dummelow, *The One Volume Bible Commentary* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), p. 39.

2) Onan was not killed by God principally because of his levirate failure. Admittedly Onan was guilty in some way by refusing to raise up children to his brother, as very likely even at this time the levirate custom had the force of law, but this guilt would not in itself have demanded so severe a penalty. The Mosaic law (Deut. 25:5-10) had a determined sanction, as we have seen, for failure to perform the levirate duty. This sanction was not death, but a relatively mild penalty. Therefore, if Onan were killed by God simply because he failed in the levirate duty, we would be forced to admit that God punished Onan with severity beyond measure, and in fact, beyond the measure of the law which He later gave to Moses. This especially so, since Onan did at least fulfill part of the law: he took Thamar to wife, even though he did not raise up seed to his brother. This position becomes even stronger when we recollect that the levirate law as observed by the other ancient peoples, the Hittites and Assyrians, carried with it no sanction whatsoever.

3) If the penalty of death were inflicted on Onan simply and solely because of his levirate failure then we fail to see why Juda did not suffer the same penalty. Juda was bound by the law to give Thamar, the widow, to his third son Sela on the death of Onan. He avoided this duty by a pretext. He admitted that he was guilty: "she (Thamar) is juster than I; because I did not give her to Sela my son" (v. 26), yet he was not punished by God. Therefore, we believe that Onan was killed by God for some further transgression than simply his levirate failure. That further transgression was the crime that bears his name, *onanism.*

4) In examining the text above (g. II) we suggested, as many hold, that Her, the firstborn, committed the same crime as Onan and hence was killed by God. This may be somewhat difficult to demonstrate satisfactorily, but we believe it is a well-founded opinion, based on the similarity of the expressions in both instances. Supposing this to be so, it gives us a further and confirmatory reason for our stand. Her was in no way bound by the levirate law since he was the firstborn of Juda, hence no levirate failure could have been attributed to him. The similarity of expressions, "was wicked in the sight of Yahweh," as used of Her and Onan suggest the same crime, as does also the similar fate of the two brothers. This leads to the conclusion that Onan

was not killed principally because of the levirate failure but because he, like Her, did something wicked in the eyes of God. This *something* is recounted in detail of Onan and suggested as regards Her.

B. We believe that Onan was killed by God *secondarily,* or also, because he failed in the levirate duty. This is, as we have seen, admitted by a number of Catholic authors and follows from the context. Onan undoubtedly had a duty of fraternal charity towards his dead brother founded in the levirate law. He recognized this duty by taking Thamar to wife, but by a shameful act he intended to defeat the law. He was guilty, then, and was killed by God for performing an immoral act with the intention of not having children that should bear his brother's name. We include this guilty intention in the sin of Onan because of the context which shows, as does the more complete investigation of the levirate custom, that Onan had a real obligation in this regard, and that he failed against it.

SUMMARY

From an examination of the text of Gen. 38:8-10 in the light of its context, we find that Onan the son of Juda repeatedly performs an action which is wicked in the sight of God. Onan does this to avoid an important duty incumbent on him as the next surviving brother of Her, the firstborn of Juda. It is, however, the revolting action that is characterized by the text as wicked in the sight of God. Onan, therefore, is punished by God with death because of this action. Onan's intention was also wicked since he wished to avoid the duty of raising up children that would bear his brother's name. The punishment of God must therefore be considered as directed secondarily against this evil intent. These facts lead us to the conclusion that in this narrative of Genesis can be found a valid argument against the abusive intereference with conception that now bears the name of Onan, *onanism.* The argument constitutes an appeal to Sacred Scripture: if God, who is eminently just, punished Onan with death because of a certain action, it follows that that action must be very wicked. Hence, we think that an efficacious argument against the crime of birth prevention is really to be found in this narrative. Justly, then, does Pope Pius in his encyclical appeal to God's punishment of Onan as an argument against contraception.

Justly, too, can preachers and writers, following the example of the Holy Father, appeal to this passage of Genesis in combating the evil of contraception, all too-prevalent even at the present time. In so doing, however, they should remember that this scriptural appeal, though constituting a valid argument, does not present the whole case against birth control. The full malice of this evil practice is demonstrated on other grounds where it is clearly proved that it violates the dictates of true morality, in that it is a crime against the natural law.

C. F. DEVINE, C.SS.R., S.S.L.

St. Alphonsus Seminary
Woodstock, Ontario, Canada

EXPOSITION OF THE MISSAL EPISTLES FROM ROMANS

VII

The following passage from Romans is the epistle for the fourth Sunday after Pentecost:

> 8:18 I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are
> not worthy to be compared with the glory to come that
> 19 will be revealed in us. For the eager longing of crea-
> 20 tion awaits the revelation of the sons of God. For
> creation was made subject to vanity—not by its own
> will but by reason of him who made it subject—in
> 21 hope, because creation itself also will be delivered from
> its slavery to corruption into the freedom of the glory
> 22 of the sons of God. For we know that all creation
> groans and travails in pain until now.
>
> 23 And not only it, but we ourselves also who have the first fruits of the Spirit—we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption as sons, the redemption of our body.

This passage occurs in a section which St. Paul devotes to the consideration of the faithfuls' adoptive sonship. In the immediately preceding section, which forms the epistle for the eighth Sunday after Pentecost, St. Paul points to the inner conviction we have of being the sons of God, and to the corroborative testimony of the Holy Spirit, who abides in the soul of the just man.[1]

In the present passage he points to two further indications of our sonship. The first is the eager longing of all creation (vv. 18-22) and the second is the eager yearning of the faithful for the complete and final realization of their sonship and the entrance into the full enjoyment of our heavenly inheritance on the day of the general resurrection (v. 23).

In the text of the epistle itself the opening words are connected with the immediately preceding statement by the connective *for,* which the Missal text omits. St. Paul had just declared that an essential condition for our attaining our heavenly inheritance is suffering with Christ. Now he says by implication that we are not to allow the prospect of sufferng to alarm us, for the sufferings that we must endure in this life are as nothing compared to the joys of heaven.

---

[1] This passage is discussed in the July, 1942, issue of the Quarterly, Vol. IV. No. 3. pp. 244-251.

I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come that will be revealed in us.

The term *I reckon* is here used in the first non-obsolete meaning given in Webster's New International Dictionary, and not in the last meaning. In the last meaning, which is quite commonly employed in certain parts of the United States it exprsses a supposition made on more or less conjectural grounds; it implies a degree of uncertainty. But in the first meaning it connotes a sure conclusion arrived at after a process of calculation or weighing.

In the present instance, St. Paul declares that he has balanced the sufferings of the present time against the glory to come, and finds that there is no comparison, so far does the blessedness of heaven outweigh the sorrows of the present time.

The sufferings of the present time are the hardships, trials and struggles incidental to the Christian life in this valley of tears during the Apostle's own life time when he was still in his "earthly house." Conditions, however, do not greatly change from one generation to another, and so the same trials which the Apostle and his contemporaries had to undergo, confront, in varying degrees, all in succeeding generations who sincerely strive to lead the Christian life. No one had more bitter and prolonged experience of the hardships of life in Christ than had St. Paul. He had suffered tremendously for the cause of His Lord, as he informs us in several passages of his epistles (e.g. 2 Cor. 11:23-30; Gal. 4:13-14; 1 Thess. 2:2). And on the other hand no one had been given such an insight into the glory of heaven as he, since he had been "caught up to the third heaven.... and heard secret words that no man may repeat" (2 Cor. 12:3-4).

Who, then, could have been better qualified to make an authoritative calculation of the comparative difficulty of this life's sufferings as balanced against the surpassing glory of heaven?

The other term of the comparison is *the glory to come which will be revealed in us. Glory* is used repeatedly by St. Paul to designate the splendor and blessedness of heaven. In its root meaning the word expresses praise, renown, distinction, deservedly due because of some high attainment or accomplishment, and since the attainment of God and the realization of our final destiny are the highest possible distinction and the greatest imaginable achievement, it is aptly called *glory.* St. John Chrysostom remarks that for lack of a better word St. Paul uses the word *glory* as that which appears to be especially desired by men, since it is the sum and summit of blessings.

This glory already exists and is actually enjoyed in its fulness, both in body and soul, by our Blessed Lord and His Virgin Mother. It only awaits God's appointed time to be revealed in or upon or unto us, i.e. overflow upon and envelop us in our soul when after death it is admitted to heaven and both in body and soul after the general resurrection.

This glory is to be revealed *in us,* i.e. *within us.* This world's glory, remarks St. Thomas, is in those things which are extrinsic to us, such as riches, but heavenly glory will consist of those things that are within us.

St. Paul's conclusion, after weighing the sufferings of this life—no matter how atrocious, appalling and prolonged they may be—against the joys of heavenly blessedness, is that they *are not worthy to be compared to it.* They are insignificant, as nothing compared to it, or, as he puts it elsewhere: "Our present light affliction, which is for the moment, prepares for us an eternal weight of glory that is beyond all measure" (2 Cor. 4:17).

The foregoing statement—that there is no comparison between our present sufferings and the joys of heaven—is sometimes alleged against the Catholic doctrine of merit, and indeed against St. Paul himself who teaches the doctrine of merit. St. Thomas satisfactorily solves the difficulty: "If these sufferings are considered in themselves, they fall far below the quantity of this (heavenly) glory.... But if they are considered in as much as one bears them willingly for God's sake from the love which the Holy Spirit produces in us, man by these sufferings condignly merits eternal life, for the Holy Spirit is a fountain whose waters, i.e. effects, gush forth unto eternal life."

St. Thomas derives the excellence of heavenly glory from four heads: 1. It is eternal because it is future. Nothing is future in respect of the present time except eternity. 2. The term *glory* indicates its great dignity. 3. It is to be manifest; the saints on earth have glory but it is hidden. 4. It is to be within us, whereas earthly glory consists in those things that are extrinsic to us, such as wealth or position.

For the eager longing of creation awaits the revelation of the sons of God.

The expression *eager longing* translates a Greek word which means to stand with head erect and craning neck, with eyes peering hopefully into the distance for signs of the approach of some person or thing eagerly expected. The word is very vivid, expressing an eager, earnest and intense longing. *Creation* designates, it is generally agreed among modern commentators, the whole visible universe, exclusive of angels, who, being in possession of the beatific vision, have no unfulfilled desires, and men whose yearning for better things to come is depicted subsequently.

St. Paul personifies the visible universe just as the Psalmist and Prophets frequently do, representing the hills as skipping like lambs, the rivers and trees clapping their hands. The idea, according to St. John Chrysostom, is to emphasize the greatness of the blessings in store for the elect, so great that even inanimate nature will share in them.

How inanimate things yearn is explained by St. Thomas in that they are naturally ordinated to something, as, for example, a fruit tree yearns to produce fruit, or they are destined for better things, as the human body is destined to be glorified.

It requires but a superficial view of the physical universe to recognize that it is imperfect, lacks something, is capable of considerable improvement, and since God, who made it and made it for man's use, cannot be thought of as resting satisfied with an imperfect universe, St. Paul concludes that it is destined for better things. This destiny St. Paul in his poetic fancy depicts as an eager longing of the world.

The object of the world's yearning is *the revelation of the sons of God,* i.e. the appearance of the sons of God in all the splendor of their glorified bodies, ready to enter into their eternal inheritance. Then the imperfections which now mar the physical universe, largely in consequence of man's fall, will be removed; there will be a new heaven and a new earth (cf. 2 Pet. 3:13; Apoc. 21:1).

In verse 18 St. Paul spoke of the glory to come; in verse 19 he gives the reason why it is certainly to come; for all creation is yearning for it, and consequently the connective *for* is used.

For creation was made subject to vanity. This statement assigns the reason why creation yearns for better things to come. It was made subject to vanity at the time of Adam's rebellion against God; it was not originally so created. "Cursed is the earth in (because of) thy work (sin); briars and thorns shall it bring forth" (Gen. 3:17). But while some of the disorders in the universe resulting from man's sin are physical, the derangement is mainly moral. As some one has remarked: "Nothing in the world is in order as long as man is in disorder." Since St. Paul does not enter into details, it is better for us to remain content with the vague statement that there is something wrong with the world. It is topsy-turvy; things do not go as they ought; it is disappointing. Men are deceived by it. They are led to expect that they will find peace and contentment in amassing its wealth, or conquering and ruling vast areas of it, but sooner or later they are disillusioned. It is quite obvious that the world is weighed down by a curse. Whereas when men gaze upon the world, its natural beauties, its resources, its capacities for development, they should be reminded of its Maker, His everlasting power and divinity, and thus be led to the desire and quest for the supreme good and the originator of beauty whose loveliness is at best faintly mirrored forth in the visible world, they on the contrary in too many cases fail to see beyond the mirror itself; they stop at it, and make it the supreme object of their desires and their search, while failing utterly to see the image of its Maker in it.

That is a disorder; it is a subjection of the creation to vanity, to the vain, disordered uses of men. It is a penalty of sin, original sin, and God has permitted it as a part of man's punishment for his rebellion against his Maker.

Not by its own will but by reason of him who made it subject. St. Paul, continuing his personification of the visible universe, attributes a will to it. His meaning is simply that there is nothing in nature itself, in its inherent tendencies, or characteristics, that called for this subjection to vanity. On the contrary it is repugnant to nature to be sidetracked from its God-given ends and diverted to uses contrary to the plan of the Creator. It was God who subjected it in order that it might become an instrument for the punishment of man who had become a rebel against God. Nature in turn would become more or less a rebel against a man.

By reason of him who made it subject means *by reason of the authority of God.*

This subjection of nature to vanity, however, was not to be its final condition. It was left the hope of better things to come. That is the meaning of *in hope.*

The object of this hope or the reason for its certainty is that nature shall one day be *delivered from the servitude to corruption.*

There is a diversity of opinion as to the meaning of *corruption* in this passage, but we are inclined to the view that understands it of the perverse uses to which man puts God's creation. As time advances and science makes known more ways of utilizing the hidden forces of nature, the more corrupt seem to become the uses to which men put them. Thus, at present we have the powerful instruments of destruction which modern science has developed for the bombing of cities; the poison gases developed in chemical laboratories, the use of which, fortunately, has not thus far appeared, but which is constantly threatened; the radio which sends round the world torrents of lies; the cinema which often depicts what is degrading and morally perverting.

Neither does nature tend towards, nor does the God of nature intend this perversion of its forces and resources, yet God in His mysterious providence permits it. Man's misuse of nature in that fashion is characterized as servitude to corruption. Enslavement either of human beings or of inanimate nature is always a perversion contrary to the designs of the Creator.

But deliverance shall most certainly come. It shall come at the general resurrection when all the effects of original sin shall finally be done away with; the corruptible, mortal body of man shall put on incorruption and immortality; man shall enter into the possession of his heavenly heritage and, for man's sake, the visible universe will be transformed. Just as the inanimate creation shared in man's punishment, and became an instrument of punishment for him, so also shall it share in his glorification and become an instrument for his exaltation and reward. St. John Chrysostom uses the analogy of a nurse and royal child: "A nurse who is caring for the king's son, when he accedes to his father's throne, shares the good things along with him, so also is it with creation."

For we know that all creation groans and travails in pain until now. St. Paul, continuing his personification of inanimate nature, emphasizes the sad condition of the world by representing it as sorrowing at its condition. St. Thomas explains: All creation groans in as much as it suffers what is contrary to its nature. And it is said to travail or experience the pains of childbirth as such is the condition of whatever is on the way to producing or giving birth. So nature is on the way to a better condition.

And not only it, but we ourselves also who have the first-fruits of the Spirit—we also groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption as sons, the redemption of our body.

To this universal yearning of all creation, St. Paul and all the faithful in general—the *we* is not to be restricted to the Apostles—add their own ardent desires for the coming of a better day. It is because we have *the first-fruits of the Spirit* that our longing is so ardent. *Of the Spirit* should be taken as an appositional genitive, explanatory of *first fruits.* At baptism the faithful receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, and it is precisely because He dwells in our hearts that our hope is so strong. "Hope does not disappoint because the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us" (Rom. 5:5). The gift of the Holy Spirit is styled first fruits, not because He is the most excellent of a series of gifts, not because His presence in us is the first instalment of the gift of glory, but rather as the pledge of our future glorification in heaven. "God is warrant for us and for you, who also stamped us with his seal and gave us the Spirit as the pledge in our hearts" (2 Cor. 1:22). "We who are in this tent sigh under our burden, because we do not wish to be clothed, but rather clothed over, that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life. Now he who made us for this very thing is God, who has given us the Spirit as its pledge" (2 Cor. 5:4-5).

The object of this eager longing is *the adoption of sons.* This obviously means the plenitude of adoption, for the faithful at the moment of baptism become God's adopted sons and receive full rights as heirs to heaven. But we have not, as long as we remain in this valley of tears, entered into the full possession of heavenly joys and blessings. Our adoption has not as yet produced its full effects. It is this plenitude of adoption for which the faithful yearn during this life. That complete and full adoption entails principally *the redemption of our body.* This means not the deliverance of the soul from the body, but the deliverance of the body from the effects of original sin, particularly mortality. This will be accomplished at the general resurrection, when our bodies will be glorified; when "this corruptible body must put on incorruption, and this mortal body must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15:53); when the mortal body, having been sown in dishonor, rises in glory; having been sown in weakness, rises in power, and having been sown a natural body, rises a spiritual body (1 Cor. 15:43-44).

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

OBSCURITIES IN THE LATIN PSALTER

XVI

95. **Psalm 90:3b.** (Sunday, at Compline.)

Quoniam ipse liberavit me de laqueo venantium: *et a verbo aspero.*

The Hebrew text thus read by LXX (which V follows as usual) was evidently quite our own. LXX interprets "from a word of tumult" or "commotion." The latter, however, is rather "ruin" or "destruction" in Hebrew. The word which governs this is the one that is most astray, but without vowels the elusive *dbr* could have a wide variety of meanings. The series of developed ideas to which the root lends itself (with different vowels between the unvarying consonants) was recently the subject of a most interesting study by Fr. Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., in the pages of this Quarterly.[1] His "fourth category" of its meanings includes "speaking" or "word"; and this, being by far the most frequent, was LXX's most natural choice. Hence their "word of tumult," which V. renders "rough" or "stormy word." This, however, hardly pairs with "the snare of the hunter" just before it; and MT preserves the tradition, with other vowels, of a much more appropriate meaning than "word."

Jerome himself is nearer to this when he writes *de morte insidiarum,* though not quite near enough. The vowels of the first word in MT give us "pestilence" or "plague"; and "plague of destruction" is equivalent to "destructive" or "mortal plague." This is evidently right, and the verse should read,

For He will free me from the hunter's snare,
and from the deadly plague.

96. **Psalm 90:6b-c.** (Sunday, at Compline.)

A sagitta volante in die, a *negotio* perambulante in tenebris: ab incursu, *et daemonio meridiano.*

For the original of *negotio* we have again the ambiguous *dbr,* but here LXX, unable to make a "word" "go about in darkness," had recourse to a frequent alternative in Hebrew, where the term for "word" means not only a vocal sign, but also the "matter" or "affair" itself which is, or may be, the subject of discourse. This very use peeps out in Luke 1:37 (incidentally revealing, perhaps, an account delivered to the Evangelist in the colloquial Aramaic), where the Greek has "no 'word' shall be impossible with God," i.e., no matter or subject conceivable. But in this LXX still clings to the appropriate vowels for "word," while, as above, other vowels (as in MT) would give us "pestilence" again. Jerome prefers this in the present instance: *a peste in tenebris ambulante.*

---

[1] Vol. IV, No. 2, pp. 119 ff.

Ab incursu, et daemonio meridiano contains two roots of variation. First, *et* resulted from reading as *waw* the *yod* preformative of a verb in present time, meaning "(which) devastates." Next, the remainder of the stem, deprived of this letter, was read by LXX as a substantive meaning "demon." Jerome has *a morsu insidiantis meridie* (var. *daemonis* for *insidiantis*), as if "from the assault of him who lies in wait at noon." MT, as often in poetry, does not require a relative supplied as subject of the verb, because the latter is finite: "from the assault which," etc. Jerome's recourse to a Latin participle seems an effort to justify LXX's *daemon* through a different construction. On all accounts the text of MT seems to stand attested, and its vowel tradition supplies the corrections:

(5b) Thou shalt not be afraid of terror by night,
(6) nor of arrow flying by day;
Of *plague* that stalks in darkness,
nor of peril *that wastes at noonday.*

97. Psalm 91:11a. (Saturday, at Lauds.)

Et exaltabitur sicut *unicornis* cornu meum.

The horn, their cattle's natural instrument of offence and defence, seemed to a pastoral people the appropriate metaphor for "strength" or "power." The figure is familiar to us all. To have a "raised horn," not only effective but eminent in height, like that of stag or antelope, was to carry a conspicuous evidence of power. However, the original of *unicornis* (though LXX persistently used *μονοκέρως*) did not in Hebrew denote any fabulous creature (nor even the *rhinoceros* occasionally used as alternative by V), but the wild ox, so strong and ferocious that its horn might be spoken of as "raised" because of its deadly employment, even though not vertical in position. This is general throughout the

Psalms, and should be understood wherever the "unicorn" appears. We have seen the word already in Ps. 28:6, and need not comment on it hereafter.

98. Psalm 91:12b. (Saturday, at Lauds.)

Et in insurgentibus in me malignantibus *audiet auris mea.*

This merely renders the original too verbally. The first *in* is rather "about" or "concerning." Then the original of *audiet* is pregnant of an object not expressed—"hear what I could wish," just as, in the previous member of the couplet, "my eye will look on them that watch for me" with ultimate satisfaction, will see their defeat at last. Thus,

And of foes who assail me *my ear will hear good news.*

99. Psalm 91:15b. (Saturday, at Lauds.)

Adhuc multiplicabuntur in senecta uberi: et *bene patientes*
erunt.

Here LXX had rendered a Hebrew adjective by εὐπαθοῦντες, for which *bene patientes* was an equivalent more literal than suggestive. Both versions also began by attaching the original of *uberi* to *senecta,* whereas the rhythmic structure of the Hebrew connects the adjective with the second member of the couplet, as a part of the predicate of *erunt. Uberes* thus becomes "robust." The second predicate adjective is "luxuriant" or "flourishing," as of foliage. Jerome accepts MT entire, writing, *Adhuc fructificabunt in senectute: pingues et frondentes erunt.* This, with the trifling change in division, was evidently the LXX's text, and we may therefore read,

They will still be fruitful in old age,
robust and *flourishing* will they be.

100. Psalm 93:15b. (Saturday, at Prime.)

Quoadusque justitia convertatur in judicium: et *qui juxta illam*
omnes qui recto sunt corde.

Again too strictly verbal a rendering in LXX, which is still further deflected from idiom by its equivalent in V. The latter is forced to introduce *qui* and thus make a relative clause of the

Greek attributive phrase ἐχόμενοι αὐτῆς. This would be "next to hear" (i.e. to "justice"); but, while this exactly translates the Hebrew phrase, the latter emphasizes posteriority above proximity: "following her." Again, the Hebrew of *convertatur* is rather *revertatur:* the administration of judgment has lost the quality of justice, which the Psalmist prays that it may regain. Thus:

> Until justice returns to judgment
> and all the true-hearted *follow her.*

101. Psalm 93:20b. (Saturday, at Prime.)

Numquid adhaeret tibi sedes iniquitatis: *qui fingis laborem in praecepto?*

"Shall the throne of wickedness be allied to Thee" is quite literal, and presents no difficulty as a rhetorical question. *Qui fingis* was a Hebrew participle, which LXX could render ὁ πλάσσων to agree with θρόνος, whereas V, in making the phrase a relative clause, strangely adopts the second person. Jerome's version returns to safer ground by writing *fingens dolorem in praecepto. Laborem* translates κόπον, but this stands for a Hebrew noun meaning not only "labor" but also "trouble" and therefore "mischief." Finally, the preposition governing *praecepto* has a great variety of meanings, deriving from the radical "upon" or "over," and diverging as far as "according to" in one line and "against" in another. "According to decree" is probably (Bi.) "by statute": the corrupt administration effects "mischief" by the means of unjust laws. This may explain the *in* praecepto of V as an instrumental use of the proposition.

Zorell, with others, would correct the present vowels of the original of *fingens* to those of another verb in the imperfect, so as to express a second question with "mischief" as its subject: *opprimet violentia jus?* A second rhetorical question would indeed be a more conventional parallel for the first; see, for example, Ps. 76:8-10. But as for *jus,* the Hebrew original of *praeceptum* does not easily lend itself to the conception of "right" or "law" in the abstract. Brown-Driver-Briggs admit such a meaning, but illustrate it by the present passage alone, which is very slender evidence. In a long list of the word's use in various constructions it normally denotes a concrete "decree" or group of decrees upon a common subject. Zorell's correction (in itself a very simple one) does not seem to lead to a natural interpretation.

Following MT and Jerome, we would express Bird's interpretation in slightly altered terms:

> Can the throne of wickedness be allied to Thee,
> *which devises mischief by way of a law?*

102. Psalm 98:4b. (Friday, at Lauds.)

Tu parasti directiones: judicium et justitiam in Jacob tu fecisti.

V here follows LXX into a slight deflection of the Hebrew, which veers a trifle farther in the Latin. *Parasti* is better "hast established" or "fixed"; and *directiones* is *rectitudines.* Jerome writes *tu fundasti aequitates;* Zo. *tu statuisti aequitatis normas.* Hence,

> *Thou hast founded right ways,*
> judgment and justice in Jacob hast Thou done.

103. Psalm 99:3b. (Sunday, at Lauds.)

Ipse fecit nos, *et non ipsi nos.*

Two Hebrew monosyllables are both pronounced *lô,* and were frequently confused in earlier times. The error is generally corrected by a footnote, whereby the Massoretes, both unable and unwilling to alter the consonantal text, add their "q^ere" to the unmodified "k^ethib." This particular correction is so frequent as to suggest that copyists sometimes wrote what they heard being read to them, rather than what they could see before them, since the two unpointed forms differ in orthography but not in sound. One of them means "no" or "not," and accounts for *non* in LXX-V here, though *ipsi* is V's addition for emphasis' sake before *nos.* The other Hebrew form is the compound "to" or "for him." Here, as the Massoretes note, the original text had this latter form as a dative of the possessor: "to Him we belong," since He is our Maker. This disposes of the reflection—somewhat too naive, even with poetic license—that "we did not make ourselves," and gives us the nobler thought

> It is He who has made us, *and His we are.*

104. Psalm 100:7c. (Wednesday, at Lauds.)

Qui loquitur iniqua, non *direxit* in conspectu oculorum meorum.

LXX takes as active a verb often employed in Greek to render this particular Hebrew original, which means "confirm, establish, sanction," and the like. Here, however, the pointing of MT makes the form passive (and in future time): "will not be confirmed" or "sanctioned," which makes all plain:

> He that speaks falsehood *shall not be approved* in my sight.

105. Psalm 100:8a. (Wednesday, at Lauds.)

In matutino interficiebam omnes peccatores terrae.

Strangely LXX uses a second aorist for a Hebrew form which ought to have been plainly enough a future, even in the unpointed text: "I will destroy." The preceding phrase *in matutino* is clear enough and correctly rendered, but not to be taken ultra-literally. The Hebrew for "morning" is in the plural, and governed by a preposition which gives it the distributive force of "morning by morning," i.e. "day by day" or "continually," without reference to the time of day. Hence,

> *Daily will I destroy all the sinners of earth.*

(*To be continued*)

WILLIAM H. MCCLELLAN, S.J., S.T.D.

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Maryland

EXEGETICAL NOTES

JESUS AND THE *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ* (Mk. 3:21-21)*

1. THE TEXT

The Vulgate: 20. Et veniunt ad domum: et convenit iterum turba, ita ut non possent neque panem manducare. 21. Et cum audissent sui, exierunt tenere eum: dicebant enim: Quoniam in furorem versus est.

Variant readings: v. 21 "Sui" in most Vulg. MSS, but one Vulg. MS has "discipuli" and four others either "disicpuli sui" or "sui discipuli." "In furorem versus est" (i.e. furiosus est) in most Vulg. MSS, but one Vulg. MS has "demens factus est."

The Greek: 20. *Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον· καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ ὄχλος, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν.* 21. *καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη.*

Variant readings: v. 20. *Ἔρχεται* (i.e. venit in B S W Γ b r Sy^{s} Sa Bo and in editions of Tischendorf (8th ed.), Nestle, Merk; the plural *ἔρχονται* (i.e. veniunt) in S^{c} C L Vulg and in edition of Vogels. v. 21. *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ* (lit., "qui ab [vel cum] eo erant," seu "sui") is the accepted reading in the editions of Tischendorf (8th ed.), Nestle, Vogels, Merk; *περὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ γραμμάτεις καὶ οἱ λοιποί* in W D, "de eo scribae et ceteri" in nine Vet Lat MSS, and "de eo scribae et pharisaei" in one Vet Lat MS. *'Εξέστη* is the accepted reading in editions of Tischendorf (8th ed.), Nestle, Vogels, Merk; *ἐξέσταται αὐτούς* in D* = "ex(s)entiat eos" in six Vet Lat MSS.

2. POSSIBLE INTERPRETATIONS OF WORDS AND PHRASES

v. 20. *And they came,* i.e. Jesus and His disciples; or *And he came,* i.e. Jesus. *To the house* (lit. home) at Capharnaum, probably that of Peter (cf. Mk. 1:29; 2:1f). *And again a crowd* (*ὁ ὄχλος*, masc., turba, fem.) *gathered.* v. 21. *And when οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ,* i.e. either His relatives distinct from those mentioned in 3,31ff, or His disciples and friends of Capharnaum. or those who were with Him as e.g. His disciples, friends and also His adversaries as the Scribes and Pharisees. *They went out,* i.e. either from their homes in Nazareth, or Capharnaum, or from the house mentioned in v. 20. *κρατῆσαι αὐτόν* = tenere eum, i.e. either *to lay hold of him* or *to hold it* (i.e. the *ὄχλον* (masc.), the crowd) *in check* (cf. Luke 24,16; Apoc. 7,1). *Ὅτι ἐξέστη* either *he has gone mad*[1] ("in furorem versus est" Vulg.) or *it* (i.e., *the crowd*) *is amazed* in the sense of D* and the Vet Lat ex(s)entiat eos, i.e. "he amazes them."

---

* Cf. Hartmann, Gerhard, S.J., "Mk. 3,20f." in *B. Z.* 11 (1913), pp. 249-279.

[1] In this sense of being beside oneself *ἐξίστημι* amongst class writes has usually the addition of *τόῦ φρονεῖν*, or *τῶν φρενῶν*, or *τῶν λογισμῶν.*

Because of these various possible interpretations Knabenbauer is right when he says: "Plura sunt in hac brevi narratione et obscura et controversa atque dubia" (ad loc.).

3. VARIOUS EXPLANATIONS OF THE TEXT

a) Explanations based upon the Vulgate

1. "But when his own (i.e. disciples and friends of Capharnaum) had heard of it (i.e. the large concourse of people, so that He and His Apostles could not so much as take their food), they went out (i.e. from their own houses in Capharnaum) to lay hold of him, for they said, 'He has gone mad.'"

This reconstruction and interpretation of the text by Knabenbauer and others are unsatisfactory. The "sui" are limited to the disciples and friends of Jesus at Capharnaum because of the word "exierunt," which is interpreted as, "they came out of their own homes." But, then, had they not already witnessed at Capharnaum similar assemblies of people (Mk. 1:33; 2:2), and had not the town as well as its people on several previous occasions been astonished at His teaching and miracles (Mk. 1:22,27)? These disciples and friends of Jesus knew and experienced that Jesus was the master of every situation, and now they are supposed to have come suddenly to the conclusion that He has gone mad or to have pretended this, in order to save Him from the assembled crowd. No hint, however, of such reasoning or attempt may be found either in the context, or in the Gospel, or in the other Gospels.

2. "But when his own (i.e. relatives of Nazareth) had heard of it (i.e. the large concourse of people, so that He and His Apostles could not so much as take their food), they went out (i.e. from their homes in Nazareth) to lay hold of him: for they said 'He has gone mad.'"

The majority of Catholic scholars refer the "sui" to His relatives and explain that they came from afar, i.e. most likely from Nazareth. These relatives are usually distinguished from "his mother and his brethren" mentioned in Mk. 3:31 (par.). Motivated by piety or the sense of duty, or by the consideration of the welfare of the family, these relatives wish to protect the life of Jesus from the crowd and from the persecution of His enemies and to bring Him back to Nazareth. Either they are merely quoting what other people are saying, or they believe that Jesus has gone mad (but in a modified sense), or they are using this report as an excuse to take Him more easily into custody, bcause Jesus, who once lived among them, did not seem to them to differ from the rest of the people.

This explanation has also its weaknesses. The journey from the mountainous regions of Juda or Galilee to Lake Tiberias is usually described in the Gospels not as "exire" (*ἐξέρχομαι*) but as "descendere" (*καταβαίνω*: cf. Mk. 3:22; Jn. 2:12; 4:47,49,51; or *κατερχομαι*: cf. Lk. 4:31). Since the second Evangelist calls the relatives in 3:31 (in the same context) by the technical name "his brethren," it does not seem that the "sui" refer to His relatives. Furthermore, the interpretation is not consistent with the entire context, in which Jesus is defending Himself against the Scribes and Pharisees before the enthusiastic crowds that He is not in league with Beelzebub.

Both of these interpretations are based upon the Vulgate text, the variant readings of which are of minor importance. It may be assumed that they are based upon the Vulgate of St. Jerome, the revised text of the Vetus Latina. But then we ought to proceed further and explore the possibilities of the original Greek text and the pre-Jerome Latin text in this particularly difficult passage.

b) A possible explanation based upon the Greek text

"But when those who were with him (in the house) had heard (i.e. the crowd outside), they went out (i.e. of the house) to restrain it (*αὐτόν*, i.e. *τὸν ὄχλον*, turbam, the crowd), for they said, "It (i.e. the crowd) is amazed."

This translation is as probable as those based upon the Vulgate, and is confirmed to a certain extent by D* and the Vetus Latina, the context and parallel passages, and negatively by tradition.

1. The preposition *παρά* with the genitive (= Latin *a* or *ab* with ablative) occurs with a verb of "coming," which actually takes place in some manner or is anticipated. In the first case the verb in the relative clause can easily be supplied. Thus *οἱ παρά τινος* are those who come *from* someone, i.e. the kinsmen or relatives, and it is applied in this manner in 1 Mach. 13:52 (LXX). In the second case *παρά* with the genitive appears and stands under the anticipated influence of the main verb which is expressed in the passage. Examples of this usage may be found in 1 Mach. 9:44,58; 16:16. Perhaps 1 Mach. 15:15 may be cited as a good parallel: "Venit (*ἦλθεν*) autem Numenius, et qui cum eo fuerant (*οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*) ab (*ἐκ*) urbe Roma, habentes epistolas, etc." Here as in Mk. 3:21 we have the identical words *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ* and (*ἐξ*) *ἔρχομαι* (*ἐκ*) i.e. those *with* him.

The Marcan text clearly distinguishes His mother and His brethren (3:31ff) from those people who were *with* Jesus in the house, as His disciples, friends, and also His adversaries, the Scribes and Pharisees (cf. Codex Beza, Vetus Latina). These people, when they heard (*ἀκούσαντες*) the noisy crowd outside the house, went out of that house (*ἐξῆλθον*) in order to restrain and hold in check (*κρατῆσαι*) the crowd (*αὐτόν* refers to *ὄχλος* and not to Jesus). The last part of v. 21 gives the reason why they were restraining the crowd, which also is the subject of *ἐξέστη*, i.e. the crowd is amazed (cf. Codex Bezae, Vetus Latina).

The incorrect translation of the Vulgate, according to Hartmann and Pölzl-Innitzer,[2] is due to its close adherence to the Vetus Latina, which was influenced by an earlier Latin interlinear translation of the Greek Diatessaron. This Diatessaron of Tatian, according to Vogels, also bore its influence upon Codex Bezae. This may explain why the Vetus Latina MSS agree with Codex Bezae in v. 21. In translating the Greek prototype, the ὁ ὄχλος (masc.) was rendered into the Latin by "turba" (v. 20), but the Greek masculine was retained in other places of the passage and in this manner the exegetical difficulty was brought into the Vulgate edition of St. Jerome.

2. The context of St. Mark as well as analogous expressions in St. Matthew seem to confirm this interpretation. Both St. Mark 3:1-35) and St. Matthew (12:9-50, with the exception of 10:1-4, which coincides with Mark 3:13-19) follow here the same logical arrangement of the subject matter. After our passage, which is proper to St. Mark, both Evangelists treat of the calumnies of the Pharisees and Scribes. Jesus cured a possessed man, who was blind and dumb, and all the crowds were amazed (*ἐξίσταντο πάντες ἱο ὄχλοι*, Mt. 12:23; this is rendered by St. Luke (11:14) with *ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι*) and immediately in St. Mark (3:22), St. Matthew (12:24), (note *ἀκούσαντες*), and St. Luke (11:15) there follows the blasphemy of the Scribes and Pharisees. Thus they did counteract the amazement of the crowds; the subject of *ἐξεστη* is not Jesus but the *ὄχλος*, and nothing is further said of the people than that they were amazed and marvelled.

The entire scene may, therefore, be reconstructed in this manner. Great crowds gathered about His home in Capharnaum, probably because of the miraculous cure of the blind and mute demoniac (cf. Mt. 12:22-23). Within the house had been the disciples and some Pharisees. In order to restrain these crowds both the disciples and the Pharisees left the house, but with different motives. The Pharisees tried to undermine the prestige of our Lord, attributed this miracle to the power of Beelzebub, and spread the word that He was in alliance with the devil. Our Lord then heard of this calumny from His disciples and repudiated this false charge. Or we may also assume that the disciples alone came out of the house to restrain the crowds, who were being incited to hatred of our Lord by the charge that He was in league with the devil.

3. The early tradition of the Church is not favorable to the translation of the Vulgate. In considering the citations and allusions of the Fathers to Mk. 3:20f, we are restricting ourselves to the splendid, though not complete, researches of Father Hartman of Feldkirch, Austria (*op. cit.*, 268-279).

---

[2] *Kommentar zum Evangelium des heiligen Markus* (2 ed., Graz and Vienna 1916) *ad locum.*

Having carefully examined the exegetical works of the Latin Fathers, as St. Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367/368), St. Ambrose (d. 397), St. Jerome (d. 420), St. Augustine (d. 430), the poetical Gospel Harmony of Juvencus (composed c. 330), and the scriptural references given in the Corpus Vindobonense, Father Hartmann concludes that there is neither a citation of nor an allusion to Mk. 3:20f, and that there is nowhere any trace of a suggestion that the disciples or relatives of Jesus came to take hold of Him, because they thought that He had gone mad.

In the East the Syrian MSS have either "His brethren" (Sy^s) or "His relatives" (Sy^{ph}), but how these passages were explained exegetically still remains a mystery. The only Greek commentary to the Gospel of St. Mark is that of Victor of Antioch (perhaps of the fifth century), whose interpretation of Mark 3:21 is very obscure. The Apostolic Fathers do not cite Mk. 3:21, or any passage in Matthew, Mark, or Luke, which would throw any light upon our text. The other Fathers of the Eastern Church, as, e.g. St. John Chrysostom (d. 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), St. Isidore of Pelusium (d. 440), Hesychius of Jerusalem (d. after 451), Nonnus of Panopolis (ca. 400), St. Cyril of Axelandria (d. 444), Ammonius of Alexandria (fifth century), etc., refer at times to the unbelief of the brethren of Jesus, but never have any reference to Mk. 3:21.

Thus it seems evident that the tradition of the West and the East prior to St. Jerome cannot be assumed to have been the basis of the Vulgate interpretation of Mk. 3:21.

JOHN E. STEINMUELLER, S.T.D., S.S.L.

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Huntington, L. I., N. Y.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CORNER

THE DATE OF ABRAHAM

According to the Massoretic text there were: (1) 480 years from the foundation of the Temple (or the fourth year of Solomon) to the Exodus (1 Kgs. 6:1), (2) 430 years from the descent into Egypt to the Exodus (Ex. 12:40), (3) 215 years from the descent into Egypt to Abraham's arrival in Canaan (Gen. 12:4; 21:5; 25:26; 47:9). Now the fourth year of Solomon corresponds to about 968 B.C., so that Abraham must have entered Canaan approximately 2093 B.C.

Some doubt is cast on the trustworthiness of this date by two divergent readings of the Septuagint. In Ex. 12:40, the Septuagint, supported by the Samaritan Pentateuch, states that 430 years elapsed from Abraham's entrance into Canaan to the Exodus, thus reducing the duration of the sojourn in Egypt by one half. In 3 Kgs. 6:1, the Septuagint assigns 440 instead of 480 years to the interval between the foundation of the Temple and the Exodus. By assuming either one or both of these divergent readings to be correct we obtain three other possible dates for Abraham's advent into Canaan: 2053, 1878, 1838 B.C.

We shall not endeavor to eliminate any of these four possibilities by showing that the variant readings of the Septuagint are corrupt or suspect. It is our purpose rather to discover which of these dates harmonizes best with the historical events narrated in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis.

It will suffice for our purpose to recall certain details of this chapter, without venturing to elucidate all its obscurities. Four eastern kings invade Palestine: Amraphel of Shinar (Sennaar), Arioch of Ellasar (Pontus), Chedorlaomer (Chodorlahomor) of Elam, and Tidal (Thadal), king of the nations. They inflict a crushing defeat upon five kings of southern Palestine. Sodom is sacked and Lot is taken captive. On hearing of this disaster, Abraham with 318 retainers pursues the victorious invaders, routs them, recovers the prisoners and the booty, and returns in triumph to Hebron.

Chedorlaomer seems to have been the head of the hostile expedition. The Palestinian kings are said to have served him for twelve years and then to have revolted against him (v. 4). Moreover, his name usually heads the list of the eastern kings (vv. 5,9), although in one instance Amraphel's name is first (v. 1).

Ever since the discovery of the Hammurabi stele, containing the legal code of this great Babylonian monarch, there has been a strong tendency among historians and biblical scholars to identify him with Amraphel. The fact that the latter is said to have been king of Shinar seemed to favor this opinion. Shinar occurs five times in the Old Testament. In three passages it certainly denotes Babylonia (Gen.

10:10; 11:2; Dan. 1:1); in the others it may easily do so (Is. 11: 11; Gen. 14:1,9). Hence, like Hammurabi, Amraphel may have been a king of Babylonia.

In support of this view, Deimel, the distinguished Sumeriologist, called attention to the fact that *dimir* was a dialectic form of *dingir* (god). Hence, he argued that Shinar, which must have been pronounced somewhat like Shingar, could have evolved from Shumer, the ancient cuneiform name for southern Babylonia.[1]

A better argument for the identity of the two monarchs was based on the alleged similarity of the two names. The initial consonants are not the same. But it was pointed out that Hammurabi is also written Ammurabi in the Babylonian records. The final Lamed in Amraphel proved to be somewhat perplexing. It was noticed, however, that in the cuneiform documents Hammurabi's name is occasionally preceded by the determinative for a divine person, so that the name must be read ilu-Hammurabi in Accadian. This determinative does not form a compound with the name which it precedes but merely indicates that the name which follows is that of a divine person. True compounds such as Hammurabi-ilu (H. is god) or Hammurabi-ili (H. is my god) do occur in the cuneiform tablets, but they are the names of private individuals. The king whom we are discussing is never designated in this fashion.

To meet this difficulty two suppositions were made: (1) that the Hebrews treated ilu-Ammurapi as a true compound, (2) that they inverted the component elements when they adopted the word into their own language. In this supposition, ilu-Ammurapi would become אמרפאל in Hebrew consonants which resembles אמרפל of Gen. 14:1 ff. rather closely. But the assumption that the Hebrews treated ilu-Hammurabi as a true compound is unlikely. If we assume that they did so, the fact that they inverted the elements is not improbable, for Hebrew proper names compounded with El, the Hebrew form of ilu, frequently terminate in this component, e.g., Dani-el, Gabri-el, Phatu-el, etc. Nevertheless, even if we grant all these assumptions, one difficulty remains. Amraphel lacks an Aleph, which we should expect if it is a compound of el. Its omission might be ascribed to the interference of Hebrew scribes who may have deleted the Aleph to remove every suggestion of divinity from the name of a pagan king.

It cannot be said, therefore, that the puzzling Lamed in Amraphel has been satisfactorily explained. Burrows tried to do so by supposing that the name was derived from what he calls a Harrian source. He adduces instances to show that the Harrians, now commonly known as the Hurrians, had a tendency to add an *l* to Babylonian names.[2] But that the Hebrews should have obtained their knowledge of an important episode in Abraham's history from a totally alien, non-Semitic source is most unlikely, if not altogether impossible.

---

[1] "Sumer," *Biblica,* Vol. 2 (1922), pp. 71-74.

Moreover, there are other cogent reasons for thinking that Amraphel cannot be equivalent to Hammurabi. The name of this king is variantly written Ammura-pi, Ammura-bi, Hammura-pi, Hammurabi, and Hammuabih.[3] Luckenbill[4] has shown that these variations can only be explained on the supposition that in the time of the First Dynasty the *pi* and *bi* signs were used to render a West-Semitic *w*. Hence, the true pronunciation of the name was Hammurawih, meaning "The people is widespread." The absence of the final *ih* in some forms of the name is due to the fact that *ih* and *i'* were used interchangeably both in the Hammurabi and Kassite periods. If, in spite of all this, we would still maintain the identity of Amraphel with Hammurabi, we must suppose that the Hebrew scribes inexplicably corrupted the name.

We are not forced to adopt this desperate expedient on the ground that the chronology of Hammurabi agrees with that of Amraphel as it is determined from the Massoretic text. The most brilliant attempt to compute the reign of Hammurabi was made by Kugler,[5] who based his calculations on certain observations of the risings and settings of the planet Venus made by Babylonian astronomers in the reign of Ammizaduga, the fourth successor of Hammurabi on the throne of Babylon. He arrived at 2123-2081 B.C. as the most probable date for Hammurabi. Subsequently, under the pressure of criticism, he changed his figures to 1947-1905 B.C.[6] Finally, Fotheringham,[7] with the assistance of Langdon and Schoch, recalculated all the data and proposed 2067-2025 as the most probable date.

Unfortunately, this computation does not enable us to determine the reign of Hammurabi with absolute certainty. The risings and settings of Venus were calculated for a certain period during which it was assumed that Ammizaduga must have reigned. If we suppose that he ruled during another interval, other figures will be obtained. For the movements of Venus recorded on the cuneiform tablets are recurrent, so that the same phenomena may be repeated during widely separated epochs. Other methods for calculating the age of Hammurabi based upon Babylonian sources are even less reliable.[8]

---

[2] "Amraphel, rex Sennaar...," *Biblica*, Vol. 8 (1927), p. 352.

[3] A. T. Clay, *The Empire of the Amorites* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919), p. 113.

[4] "The Name Hammurabi," *JAOS*, Vol. 37, pp. 250-253.

[5] *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel*, II (Muenster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1912), p. 257 ff.

[6] *Von Moses bis Paulus* (Muenster: Aschendorff, 1922), pp. 497-501.

[7] *The Venus Tablets of Ammizaduga* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1928).

The discoveries made at Tell-el-Hariri, the site of ancient Mari, on the Middle Euphrates, have led to a radical revision of Babylonian chronology. It now seems very probable, if not certain, that Hammurabi reigned about 1800 B.C.[9] It follows that he cannot have been a contemporary of Abraham and identical with Amraphel unless we assign the lowest possible date to Abraham based upon the chronology of the Septuagint.

But even if we assume this date, we encounter new difficulties in identifying Chedorlaomer, the king of Elam defeated by Abraham. The name of this king is undoubtedly Elamite, being equivalent to Kudur-Lagamar, in which Lagamar designates an Elamite deity found also in the royal name Shilhina-hamru-Lagamar.[10] But the historical records show that an Elamite monarch named Kudur-Lagamar did not exist in the days of Hammurabi.

(*To be continued*)

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J., S.S.D.

St. Mary's College
St. Mary's, Kansas

---

[8] E. Ruffini, *Chronologia Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (Rome: Casa Editrice Nazionale, 1924), p. 82.

[9] *BASOR*, n. 77 pp. 20-23 esp. 25-30.

[10] Shiner-Shangar, *AJSL*, vol. 40 p. 132.

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

Biblical Archaeologist, 5, 1942. F. V. Filson, "Who are the Figures on the Chalice of Antioch?" (1-10). "If the Chalice presents the New Testament writers as a recognized group, it cannot reasonably be dated before the fourth century. A first century date is impossible. The view of Jerphanion that the Chalice portrays the apostles as a group is still a possibility."

H. Harvard Arnason, "The History of the Chalice of Antioch" (Continuation from proceding issue) (10-16). "It has not been proved that these are portraits of Christ, the Apostles, and the Evangelists. The first century date for the outer cup does not seem to have been demonstrated, and the earlier date of the inner cup remains an hypothesis. Even the relation of the chalice to the city of Antioch may be questioned." . . . "Since there does not seem to be sufficient reason to doubt the authenticity of the chalice, I may say that all the archaeological probabilities point to a date in the fourth or fifth century."

Ecclesiastical Review, 106, 1942. R. F. Stoll, "Our Lord's Farewell Discourses—II. The Second Discourse—Chapter 15." (191-204). The second of a series of three articles.

Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., "Uncouth Words in the New Version?" (220). Objects to a suggestion that "belly" in Phil. 3:19 and Rom. 16:18 be changed to "appetites." This would give a wrong meaning to the verse. "The Apostle is attacking the judaizers throughout Phil. 3 and here refers to their insisting upon distinctions between foods, a subject about which he has also had much to say in Rom. 14." He says furthermore, "Over here all who have seen the new version appear to be pleased with it."

R. F. Stoll, "Our Lord's Farewell Discourses—III" (263-76). Explains John chapter 16.

Expository Times, 53, 1942. C. D. Bacon, "Man's Destiny Hereafter: Some Greek Ideas and their Relation to New Testament Teaching" (124-6). The author traces the development of Greek thought on this subject from Homer to Plato and finds that New Testament ideas of man's destiny "are of Jewish descent and have little direct affinity with Greek conceptions." However "Contact with Greek modes of thought introduced a mystical strain into Christianity." The "sense of God as the ground and the reality of the world" was the place where "the Greek thought found a point of entry into Christian teaching."

L. H. Bunn, "Symbol and Sacrament" (149-50). The Lord's Supper was not the Paschal meal, but the Qiddush or 'Consecration' which took place on the previous evening. In the words of consecration "our

Lord was not referring . . . to the bread which He was in the act of breaking . . . , as the Synoptic account declares; rather His eyes were fixed on the approaching Sacrifice and He spoke of the Lamb which would duly be offered then." "The Bread and the Wine remain for the Christian what they always were for the Jew, the *accompaniments* of the Sacrifice."

C. J. Cadoux, "Is it Possible to Write a Life of Christ. A Second Answer" (175-7). The writer thinks it possible to write a life of Christ and points out some of the principles for the work. In regard to miracles "I hold . . . that the most defensible view is (1) to accept the healing-miracles (Matthaean exaggerations and minor Marcan and Lucan perversions apart), and to account for them as due to the psychiatric power with which Jesus was uniquely endowed, and (2) to reject the 'Nature-miracles' as legendary, not because they are inconceivable, but because they are too weakly attested." Compard to the Synoptics the rest of the New Testament is a secondary source, and there should be no "reading back into the Synoptic record features suggested by later portrayals of the glorified Christ, but either unsupported by that earlier record or perhaps inconsistent with it." While the Johannine discourses are of less value, the narrative of the Fourth Gospel rests on very early evidence and is a valuable supplement to the Synoptic story. While a detailed chronology is lacking, the several Gospel episodes may be grouped "in a series of clusters which will correspond, at least roughly, to the actual sequence in which they occurred."

R. P. C. Hanson, "Further Evidence for Indications of the Johannine Chronology of the Passion to be Found in the Synoptic Evangelists" (178-80). St. Luke says that the holy women bought spices on the day of Preparation. "It was not during the last hours of the Passover Day that the women bought the spices, but during the last hours of the day before that." Furthermore one can see "behind the Synoptists' use of the word *paraskeue* another piece of evidence that their sources contained material which followed a Johannine chronology of the Passion, because . . . the word had in their sources the same meaning as it had in the Fourth Gospel—the day of the Preparation of the Passover."

C. Ryder Smith, "An Evil Eye" (Mark vii. 22) (181-2). Discusses the meaning and devotional import of the phrase.

W. F. Lofthouse, "The Cry of Dereliction" (188-92). "Four inquiries are involved in this question, critical, exegetical, psychological and theological." I. Critical. "While then the balance of probability is that Jesus quotes Ps. 22, we cannot be sure of what He actually said." 2. Exegetical. The Gospels portray an unbroken communion of Jesus with God. If in the last hours He suddenly felt that God had deserted Him, it could only be because His abiding consciousness of His Father and of Himself had been suddenly swept away. 3. Psychological. "Assuming however that only the first words of the Psalm were in Our Lord's mind ... either we must jettison six out of the seven words on the Cross, or the mood of despair, ending as it does with another quotation from a Psalm (31,5), must have been very short-lived." 4. Theological. The "Father caused His Son to enter right into the experience of being in the wrong with God, alienated from God, though all the while He knew no sin, no alienation; in order that we might enter as fully into the experience of being right with God. But such an imaginative *Einfühlung* does not imply actual dereliction, or indeed any break in the abiding union between the two."

E. F. F. Bishop, "Hosanna: The Word of the Joyful Jerusalem Crowds" (212-4). From the Hebrew root *hasan*, having the meaning stronghold, storehouse, the author comes to the meaning, "Our stronghold is (in) the Son of David." "Our strength is in the highest." "Our stronghold; blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

F. D. Coggan, "A Note on Ephesians 2, 14. *autos gar estin he eirene hemon*" (242). Besides the obvious and usual translation, to those who were familiar with Semitic thought forms there would be present the suggestion, "He is our peace offering."

Peter Fraenkel, "Method of Work of the Author of the Fourth Gospel" (242). The Gospel shows signs of having been written fairly quickly; at several points the subject is treated as if from memory.

S. P. T. Prideaux, "John 1. 13" (242). Suggests a racial meaning for "bloods" in that verse.

T. W. Manson, "Is it Possible to Write a Life of Christ?" (248-51). There is not enough material for a life, but we can set the ministry in its historical context: we can read the history of post-exilic Judaism forward to the critical point; and we can read the history of the Early Church backwards to the same critical point. Thus some of the tensions which made the Cross inevitable will be clear and the portrait of Jesus will emerge with some sufficient clearness.

J. T. Hudson, "The Aramaic Basis of St. Mark" (264-70). "This article has examined some only of the grammatical phenomena of Mark that point to an Aramaic original. They are sufficient to prove that our earliest Gospel is a Semitic document, and must be read with ears trained to catch its Semitic nuances, whether we hold it was first composed in Aramaic or not."

J. W. Jack, "Recent Biblical Archaeology" (276-80). In western Galilee within the past five years were discovered ancient Jewish catacombs of a hitherto unknown type, dating from the II-IV century A.D.

Upon the walls were painted "numerous human figures, animals, plants, ships (including the boat of Charon), and geometric designs." Nearby the excavators unearthed the "foundations of a synagogue, basilican in form, and 'oriented' towards Jerusalem. It appears to have flourished most during the third century A.D. . . . So far as archaeological evidence goes, it is the earliest synagogue found in Palestine. . ."

F. J. Heawood, "The Last Passover in the Gospels" (295-7). Solves some unnecessary difficulties connected with that event. The Jewish day was not necessarily taken as a period of twenty-four hours rigidly reckoned from sunset to sunset. The term Passover might be used for one day or for the entire eight days. In regard to John's use of the term Feast, it may be noted that the term Passover could be used of the octave, while the Feast could be restricted to the days which followed he Passover proper. Finally there is no serious difficulty in the movements of Jesus and the disciples after the supper.

C. K. Barrett, "*Katelaben* in John i. 5" (297). The word means to grasp with the mind and so to comprehend and to grasp with the hand and so to overcome or destroy. The Fourth Evangelist frequently uses a play on words, and Lucian has an example of such a use of *katalambano*. "It seems probable that the Evangelist has anticipated Lucian's pun and means both that the darkness of the world could not understand the Light of God, and that it was unable to quench it. Incidentally, this interpretation augments the stylistic bonds which unite the Prologue to the main body of the Fourth Gospel."

Norman Snaith, "Further Note on Ephesians II. 14" (325-6). Objects to the suggestion of Coggan in the April issue that *eirene* means peace offering and proposes the parallel from Isa. 53:5 "of our peace."

C. M. Macleroy, "Notes on the Cry of Foresakenness on the Cross" (326). Identified with us in our sin, Christ experienced for us sin's separation from God.

Harvard Theol. Rev., 35, 1942. W. L. Knox, "The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel" (13-23). The abrupt ending of *ephobounto gar* cannot be maintained (contrary to Creed, Wellhausen and Meyer).

R. M. Grant, "The Fourth Gospel and the Church" (95-116). For half a century after its appearance the Gospel was not used extensively by any orthodox writer. "The next period is one in which the Gospel is revised; an appendix (chapter xxi) is probably added to make clear its claim for apostolicity and truth. One occasion of this appendix might be the publication of the three-fold gospel, possibly at Rome, but almost equally probably in Asia Minor." The claims of the Fourth Gospel are based on a non-historical, symbolic, "beloved disciple."

Hibbert Journal, 40, 1942. Hugh Ross Williamson, "The Necessity of Resurrection" (245-251). The Apostles believed that Christ rose from the dead; else they would not have preached at all. But that was not a revolutionary doctrine. "For 4,000 years, the idea of the resurrection of the Slain King-God had been the pivotal point of all civilized belief." Therefore, Christ had to be preached as risen.

R. A. Edwards, "The Evidence for the Resurrection" (252-259). Discusses the objection that the N. T. does not give us the kind of evidence for the Resurrection which a modern investigator of abnormal phenomena has a right to demand. "Instead of sworn statements and legal paraphernalia, things that might have been ingeniously concocted, we have a bundle of papers, almost accidental survivals from the first days of Christianity; in the bundle are students' notebooks, personal letters and the like, in which the story of the Resurrection is simply told, and its truth frankly taken for granted. The weight of such unusual evidence is, I suggest, more considerable than at first sight we might suppose."

Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 59, 1942. H. Pope, "Should We Continue to Use Challoner's Version in Church?" (120-7). He reviews the history of many translations and concludes that changes in the text must be made only when the interest of truth demands it. Otherwise the susceptibilities of the hearers will be offended.

A. O'Rahilly, "The Burial of Christ. Peter and John at the Tomb." Concludes a series of four articles (150-71). "A relic such as the Shroud of Turin must be examined on its merits. It is difficult to see how it could be rejected on scriptural grounds; the attempt—e.g. of Dom. Germain Morin—to proclaim Père Braun's articles as the last word is, as I think I have now proved, premature and unscientific."

Jewish Quarterly Review, 32, 1942. Solomon Zeitlin, "Aramaic Gospels in the Synagogue" (427-31). Reviewing Torrey's *Documents of the Primitive Church,* Professor Zeitlin disagrees with the author who maintains that no section of the Gospels is later than 50 A.D. For one instance the very use of Passover instead of Feast of Unleavened Bread shows John wrote after the destruction of the Temple. Moreover John was written in Greek not in Aramaic (contrary to Torrey), since he uses *paraskeue.* "Only pagan writers used the word paraskeue referring either to the eves of Sabbath or holidays . . . Hellenized Jews . . . had the words *pro sabbaton. . .*" Finally "there was never a time when the Synagogue had to carry on a fight against the canonicity of the Gospels."

Journal of Biblical Literature, 51, 1942. A. Wikgren, "*arche tou euangeliou*" (11-20). Suggests that *arche* at the beginning of Mark may mean first thing in the sense of rudiments or elements or essentials of the gospel. The author praises Fr. Kleist, S.J. who in his *Memoirs of St. Peter* translates the word as "Summary," and Wohlenberg who takes the word to mean the first step of the instruction about Jesus.

H. R. Willoughby, "Stray New Testament-Psalter Leaves Identified" (57-60). In the John Frederick Lewis Collection of the Free Library in Philadelphia are two manuscript leaves from a Greek codex, which included both a NT and a Psalter. By every possible test it is proved that these folios came from Ms. 1 in the Palermo Museum.

C. C. Torrey, "The Aramaic of the Gospels" (71-85). Supplements an article which Olmstead published in the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (Jan. 1942). "There was much more Aramaic literature in use in Palestine in the last centuries B.C. and the first century A.D. than Olmstead supposes. . ." A Gospel intended for the Jews of Palestine must necessarily be written in Aramaic.

Journal of Bible and Religion, 10, 1942. J. P. Love, "The Nature of the Synoptic Message" (80-7). Presents the Synoptic picture of human nature, of divine nature, of Jesus Christ and His teachings and the significance of the kingdom in the Synoptics.

P. S. Minear, "The Relevance of the Message for Our Day" (88-92). The relevance does not depend upon systems of evidence. The true relevance of the gospels has been shown by the emphases of Baultmann, Dibelius, Dodd and Tillich concerning the kingdom and eschatology. God's kingdom remains the only source of meaning for the relativities of human existence. "The message of the gospels is relevant to our day because it tells of an event, at once historical and contemporaneous, which gives meaning and direction to all other events."

F. V. Filson, "Significant Books on the Message of the Gospels" (93-7). A bibliography of English works published since the first world war.

E. J. Goodspeed, "The Possible Aramaic Gospel" (31-40). A reply to Olmstead's article in the January issue. There was an extensive Greek literature in the first century A.D. At least 22 Greek authors are acknowledged by all as having published between A.D. 20 and 80, while many others wrote in Greek, although the Aramaists might dispute them. On the other hand no Aramaic literature has been proved for the same period, but has been presumed to exist because the people spoke Aramaic.

Journal of Religion, 22, 1942. B. LeRoy Burkhart, "The Rise of the Christian Priesthood" (187-204). The Christian priesthood appeared simultaneously in Rome and in North Africa *circa* A.D. 200. Sacrificial and sacerdotal terms were found in the Christian movement from the beginning, but in a spiritualized sense. "Between A.D. 150 and 200 pagan criticism of the Christians for their atheism . . . led Justin Martyr to identify the prayer of thanksgiving over the eucharistic elements as the Christian sacrifice par excellence. Once made, this identification was generally adopted..." And from the sacrifice of the Eucharist soon came the idea that the officiant at the rite should be called a "priest."

C. F. Nesbitt, "An Inquiry into the Physical Health of Jesus" (302-12). The frequent references to retirements of Jesus may be due to exhaustion of His physical powers from overwork, or to the enervating heat of the low country about Tiberias and of the Jordan valley. Moreover as malaria was common in that region, He may have been affected. When it is recalled that he died quite early on the cross to the surprise of those standing by, it is at least possible that lurking malarial germs in his blood stream *plus* the extraordinary physical strain of his last few days may have been reason enough for his premature death."

Journal of Theological Studies, 43, 1942. C. C. Tarelli, "Some Further Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus on the Gospels" (19-25). A study of several readings in the papyrus shows that "it is not by any means a safe rule to reject, as a matter of course, the most correct or elegant of two or more readings" as a later addition, and the text of P 45 does not confirm the thesis that B has a 'peculiar habitual purity' in word order.

G. Zuntz, "The Byzantine Text in New Testament Criticism" (25-30). "The Reconstruction of the Byzantine text is a necessary preliminary to the production of a thesaurus exhibiting, within surveyable limits, the whole material for the criticism of the New Testament. A *Novum Testamentum criticorum et editorum in usum* would consist of two parts: (1) the reconstructed Byzantine norm, and (2) a repertory containing all the non-Byzantine matter, in a separate volume. In their combination the two parts would give a complete picture of the tradition."

G. D. Kilpatrick, "A Theme of the Lucan Passion Story and Luke XXIII. 47" (34-6). Of the two possible meanings of *dikaios* in Lk. 23:47, that of 'righteous' must be rejected as being quite pointless, while that of 'innocent' fits in well with the general theme of the chapter. Furthermore the notion of innocence suits the general purpose of the Gospel and the readers whom he addresses, the wealthier and more highly educated elements of the pagans population, at least Theophilus may have moved among them. Agreeing with Dr. Creed who rejected Streeter's Proto-Luke, Kilpatrick thinks that Luke has very freely edited the Marcan account so that "much that is assigned to Proto-Luke belongs to the evangelist and, more important, all trace of a continuous Passion narrative other than that of Mark as a source for Luke vanishes. With its disappearance there must disappear as well the theory of Proto-Luke itself."

C. S. C. Williams, "Tatian and the Text of Mark and Matthew" (37-42). Taking a few of Fr. Merk's readings combined with Legg's evidence the writer finds instances which suggest the influence of the Diatessaron on Greek manuscripts like 713 (Matthew) and a lectionary 184 (Mark), as well as on Western texts like g.

C. Jenkins, "A Newly Discovered Reference to the 'Heavenly Witnesses' (I John V. 7,8) in a Manuscript of Bede" (42-5). The manuscript contains the passage with the three witnesses in heaven followed by the three on earth. Although "the form of the testimony of Father and Spirit could be paralleled without much difficulty the reference to the Son's testimony is more unusual, and the later doctrinal passage notable.... The discovery is in fact likely to prove so troublesome as to ask for examination of all manuscripts of Bede on the Catholic Epistles, whatever their date, in order to see if the Balliol manuscript stands alone or finds supporters."

J. L. Teicher, "Christian Theology and the Jewish Opposition to Maimonides" (68-76). The whole opposition against Maimonides seems primarily inspired by Christian theological conceptions. One accusation brought was that he denied the existence of demons, a misreading of his text, and occurring only in the translation current among Christians. Moreover the "reasons for this condemnation can be better explained on the ground of Christian than of Jewish theology. The existence of demons or devils is explicitly admitted in the New Testament, and to gainsay it means to deny certain events in the life of Jesus; but it is a problem scarcely relevant to Jewish theological conceptions." Another charge was his false doctrine of prophecy. "In fact Maimonides' visionary theory denying their objective reality [appearances of angels] subverts the Christian doctrine that the events of the Old Testament are the prefiguration of the life of Jesus Christ, and it is precisely for these reasons that his theory is rejected by Thomas Aquinas." Maimonides' was a creative monistic philosophy while that of his opponents who maintained that the accounts of the Bible represent the true historical reality, res gestas, was a dualistic conception of the universe.

Theological Studies, 3, 1942. L. J. McGinley, S.J. "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives" (203-30). Novelle and Miracle-Story. The third of a series of articles.

JOHN J. COLLINS, S.J.
A. C. COTTER, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Massachusetts

BOOK REVIEWS

STEPHEN J. HARTDEGEN, O.F.M., *A Chronological Harmony of the Gospels.* (Paterson: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1942). Pp. 220. Price, $2.50.

Since the time of Tatian's *Diatesseron* innumerable attempts have been made at synchronizing the Gospel narrative, and the passing of centuries has attested to the usefulness of such attempts—pedagogical aids—to convey a panorama of the activity of our Savior here on earth. The study of a single Gospel cannot satisfactorily be made without a comparison with the rest since, as Origen says, "The Gospel written by four is but one Gospel." The renewal of interest in the study of Scripture has brought us two such aids, the fruit of long and careful labor on the part of two Catholic scholars, both using the Confraternity Edition of the Revised New Testament.

A harmony is the fruit of exegetical analysis. Father Hartdegen has done well, we think, to anchor his exegetical opinions by assuming the definite plan that follows the excellent resourcefulness of Father Lagrange's commentaries. All true and valid pedagogy inculcates through authority, so that the uninitiated in using the *Chronological Harmony* will ever be aware of the roots of the source material if he wishes to enlarge his views on the several problematic items that make for difference of opinion among scholars. The paramount question will always be: Is Father Lagrange a safe norm for beginners? We pass over the discussion of this question here. There is, however, the testimony of the *Chronological Harmony,* as elaborated by Father Hartdegen under the inspiration of Lagrange, that the opinions of this great scholar of our own generation do consolidate a graphic literary harmony of the Gospels that is at once appealing and logical.

In aligning himself with the scholarship of Lagrange, Father Hartdegen is obviously aware that in this strength there is some weakness, and where the latter is apparent to him he has deigned humbly to differ from the Master. For instance, Father Hartdegen allows two cleansings of the Temple—a capital feature of the Lagrange system. Again, there are pertinent remarks in the preface that really evidence the peculiar success of the author's arrangement and give a tone of originality. He is aware that the problems in a chronology turn upon the duration of Christ's ministry and "the relation of St. John to the Synoptics." This is obvious enough, but Hartdegen's reflection further on that St. John's Gospel "is the most chronological of all in the sense that he (St. John) suggests an excellent framework by threading his history along the succession of great Jewish feasts and ceremonials," precisely orientates his own harmonistic endeavors. One can see throughout the consciousness of this almost liturgical network that the Beloved Disciple left for his readers to appreciate and to use as their own instrument for ensnaring the intimate details of that sacred history. This is a little more than Lagrange has done inasmuch as the latter was adequately satisfied with the "orderly account" (Luke) for the most part. Hartdegen is, we think, right in giving emphasis to the Johannine chronology and therein confirming the historical character of the fourth Gospel.

Father Hartdegen has seen fit to introduce Preliminary Notes in the course of his arrangement. Obviously he intends the reader to follow in sequence, yet some will feel that this matter would be pedagogically safer as appendices. For the already informed these Notes are excess baggage; for others, they are an adequate though highly concentrated digest of difficult problems.

Throughout *Chronological Harmony* bears witness to the author's scholarship and painstaking research. The wealth of annotations in accordance with Canon 1391 (cf. Committee on the Authentic Interpretation of the Code, May 20, 1923, *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XVI, 116), the constant familiarity with sources that will acquaint the attentive student with a comprehensive knowledge of New Testament Bibliography, the "Outline of the Public Ministry," the table of "Contemporaneous Events in New Testament Times," three colored maps, the detailed "Outline of Chronology," an excellent general index, besides the "Index to each Evangelist," all these features represent the author's effort to make his work a handy and complete text in the hands of the Scripture student.

Your reviewer regrets the departure from one of the excellent features of the Revised New Testament—the reversion to the verse division seems to be an unnecessary retrogression.

CYRIL GAUL, O.S.B.

PROFESSOR GEORGE L. ROBINSON, *The Bearing of Archaeology on the Old Testament* (New York: American Tract Society). Pp. 207. $1.75.

Professor Robinson in his introduction to this short work (which comprises the L. P. Stone Lectures delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary) admits first that he is not a field archaeologist, and that archaeology is for him but an avocation. These facts are reflected throughout his work.

The title of the book indicates to some extent its purpose. The author, however, does not discuss a general thesis. Rather he takes the findings of modern archaeological research and shows how they illustrate and "confirm" particular texts or sections or doctrines of the Bible. The five lectures are entiled Voices from Egypt, Voices from Bablylonia, Voices from Arabia, Voices from Asia Minor and North Syria, and Voices from Palestine respectively.

It is clear that the author could not go into any deep discussions in covering so much ground. In fact one sees that only a popular presentation of the various data was intended. Hence very few sources are cited, and these are mostly of a secondary nature.

Professor Robinson is sometimes eclectic in using these sources. Where there is a disputed question he favors the opinion that represents archaeology as verifying the Bible, and does not always give enough respect to the more recent or more weighty authorities which would disagree with his opinion. Hence his conclusion that the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, and its Exodus from that country, is linked with the Hyksos domination is simple, but not sufficiently moderated by a citation of varied opinions, or the difficulties arising from such an explanation of Exodus. Hence also his identification of Amraphel of Genesis 14 as Hammurabi is to say the least doubtful, and should be noted as such in view of the warnings of most recent writers such as Albright and Bea. Especially is this identification difficult when he puts with Amraphel-Hammurabi (ca. 2100, in his dating, others put it later by more than a century) Arioch-Ariaku of Larsa (2167 B.C. according to him) and Chedorlaomer, and Tidal. It becomes increasingly hard to fit these characters into one chronology, even in the case of conjectural identification.

Again the identification of the term Hebrew ('Ibri) with Babylonian Habiru and Egyptian Apiru is insufficiently qualified. But these and other points should not prevent us from recognizing that the author has crowded much into a few pages. A perusal of the book will well repay the interested student of the Bible, especially the beginner. For while the author presents nothing new, the large number of briefly treated archeological finds which bear on the Bible, or help to illuminate it and the inclusion of references to the more recent archaeological advances, make the book a compendious guide-book to the ever broadening field of questions on archaeology and Scripture.

JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.

MANUEL KOMROFF. *In the Years of Our Lord* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942). Pp. 311. Price, $2.50.

This novel, now in its third printing, is composed of a series of incidents tenuously interlinked, with the Gospel story as background and setting. Lazarus and his family, including a fictional father called Ben Shaba, form the framework and binding link, while a shadowy and very unsatisfactory Christ appears and disappears from chapter to chapter. Some of the characters portrayed are fictitious, others are historical; with respect to the latter, however, the author is often false to his Gospel sources, and we point out three chapters in particular; 7 (the figure of Christ), 20 (Judas), and 21 (the Good Thief). The author follows a modern portrayal of Christ which has grown increasingly common in certain quarters—that of a man who is exceedingly good, a friend of God, one wholly given over to the amelioration of the lot of the downtrodden, and whose death is an unfortunate mistake. An integral part of this special delineation is a deliberate omission of all hint of divinity, and Komroff is faithful to his school. To say nothing of other sections of the novel, within the compass of chapter 15 (which concerns the resurrection of Lazarus) the term 'Son of God' is dropped from the Gospel text, once in a remark of our Lord (p. 195; cf. Jn. 11:4), and more glaringly in the case of Martha's profession of faith (p. 197; cf. Jn. 11:27). On occasion, lest a term be understood correctly, the author prepares for the false interpretation of his preference, as for instance in chapter 6 (on the Finding in the Temple) where the term 'Father' is by implication watered out into a simple synonym for God (p. 82); in a similar way clever stage-setting makes the call of Matthew seem rather the result of dissatisfaction with his occupation than the outcome of Christ's attractiveness (chapter 10). Should one nevertheless be inclined to ascribe divinity to this unusual prophet and wonder-worker, there is always the counterfoil of Xado the pagan astrologer who slips in and out of the narrative from beginning to end, and who is able to read accurately in the stars the truths of the future. Vaguely among the people is the suggestion that Christ may be the Messias, but the author makes it abundantly clear that our Lord's Messianic consciousness is a matter of growth within His own mind (cf. chapter 7 on the Temptation). Perhaps one should not go too far in stressing omissions, especially as the author gives no hint of the basis on which he has chosen the incidents actually given in the novel; but in view of what has already been indicated, it is surely legitimate to wonder why we have no hint given of such things as Baptism, Penance, Eucharist. Whatever may be said of the book's literary excellence (the author at times displays considerable skill in telling a story), it can in no way soften the undeniable fact that this novel is decidedly not a book for the average Catholic reader.

F. X. PEIRCE, S.J.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Some of these may be reviewed in subsequent issues)

Franciscan Press, Jerusalem, Palestine:

The Memorial of Moses on Mount Nebo. Part I. The Text. By Sylvester J. Saller, O.F.M. 1941. Pp. 371. Part II. The Plates. Plates 160.

The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland:

Archaeology and the Religion of Israel. The Ayes Lectures of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. By William Foxwell Albright. 1942. Pp. xii, 238. $2.25.

St. Charles Seminary, Carthagena, Ohio:

Nuntius Aulae. Volume XXV No. 2. July 1942.

The Messenger Press, Carthagena, Ohio:

A Prophetic Biography of Jesus Christ. By Rev. Vigilius H. Krull, C.PP.S. 1942. Pp. 97.

The America Press, New York, N. Y.:

Martyrdom of Slovenia. By John LaFarge, S.J. 1942. Pp. 23.

DATE DUE

AUG [illegible]7 2000	

DEMCO, INC. 38-2931

GTU Library
3 2400 00250 4599

The Catholic Biblical quarterly v.4
1942

THREE DAY

68651

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709